The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XXI JULY, 1935 No. 2

LA PÉRIODE BYZANTINE DE LA PAPAUTÉ

Trois ans après la publication du Ier tome de son histoire de la papauté, M. Caspar en a fait paraître le second.[1] Je n'hésite pas à dire que par l'ensemble prestigieux de ces deux formidables volumes M. C. peut être considéré comme un des plus grands parmi les représentants actuels de la science historique allemande, et cela avec d'autant plus de raison que la conception de cette œuvre est profondément allemande. Je l'ai fait sousentendre déjà dans le compte-rendu que j'ai fait du tome Ier dans la *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XXXII (1932), 113-135, où je reproche à M. C. la *machtanbeterische Ideologie* que l'on sait remonter à Nietzsche et Bismarck sinon plus loin, et dont on connaît universellement les derniers exploits. Mais cette œuvre est en même temps, il n'y a pas lieu de s'en étonner, intégralement protestante. Il va sans dire qu'il n'est guère possible à un historien imbu d'esprit protestant et bismarckien de raconter avec justesse et avec justice la vraie histoire de ce qu'est l'institution suprême de l'Eglise catholique.

En ce qui regarde le Ier tome, il serait superflu de répéter ici

[1] E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums von den Anfängen bis zur Höhe der Weltherrschaft.* Erster Band: *Römische Kirche und Imperium Romanum* (Tübingen, 1930), xv + 633 pp. in-8°. — Zweiter Band: *Das Papsttum unter byzantinischer Herrschaft* (Tübingen, 1933), xiv + 826 pp. in-8°. [Ce compte-rendu était sous presse quand j'appris que M. Erich Caspar était décédé subitement le 22 janvier, 1935. La disparition de cet homme plein d'esprit, travailleur infatigable et savant de grand mérite, est pour nos études une perte douloureuse.]

ce que j'ai dit dans la *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*; je me contente donc de donner des précisions sur le seul point qui semble en demander. Il s'agit de la politique religieuse de Constantin le Grand qui a été traitée dans plusieurs ouvrages récents, surtout dans un article de M. Grégoire et dans un mémoire circonstancié de M. Baynes.[2] D'après la conception de J. Burckhardt, commune avec MM. Ed. Schwartz, Caspar et Grégoire, la politique religieuse de Constantin serait l'œuvre savamment élaborée d'un homme d'état génial, par sa personne " au-dessus " des croyances de ses contemporains, mais se servant de l'Eglise chrétienne comme d'un instrument admirable pour renforcer l'organisation de l'Empire et surtout la puissance de l'empereur. Avec Seeck et M. Baynes — qui ne font, en somme, que présenter sous une forme ne choquant pas le sentiment chrétien et plus détaillée, l'opinion déjà prônée avec force, dans un esprit antichrétien, par Seeck — je suis persuadé qu'il n'en est rien. La liaison étroite entre l'Eglise et l'Etat, loin de rendre la politique intérieure plus facile, l'a au contraire, dès le début, compliquée de beaucoup, et dès le début, le pouvoir impérial se heurte douloureusement à des limites qui avaient été inconnues aux empereurs païens; ceci étant dans la nature des choses, nous devons ajouter foi à la sincérité de l'attitude de Constantin, aussi longtemps que rien ne nous oblige à la mettre en doute, car personne n'ignore que la plupart des sources le représentent comme un chrétien de conviction et qu'aucune ne nous en dit le contraire. La politique que suivit Constantin durant le dernier quart de siècle de sa vie, s'explique tout simplement par son désir d'accorder son devoir d'empereur autant que possible avec son devoir de croyant.

Parmi nos adversaires, seul M. Grégoire a pu donner une argumentation substantielle pour prouver que les événements de 313, en tant qu'ils regardent l'Eglise et l'Etat, sont le fruit d'un raisonnement purement politique, argumentation par laquelle il s'attache aussi à démontrer que le grand changement qui fait de cette année

[2] Grégoire, *Rev. de l'Univ. de Bruxelles*, XXXVI (1931), 231-272. Baynes, *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church*, 1931. Quant aux vues de M. Piganiol, justice en a été faite par M. Baynes dans la *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XXXIV (1934), 118-123, de sorte qu'il n'y a pas lieu d'y revenir.

un des tournants de l'histoire les plus importants, n'est pas dû à Constantin, mais à Licinius. Ce serait une découverte sensationnelle si c'était un fait établi. Mais en réalité la thèse ingénieuse de M. Grégoire ne résiste pas à l'examen, et j'ai d'autant plus le devoir de le démontrer qu'en plusieurs endroits, en dernier lieu par M. Palanque dans la *Rev. d. ét. anc.*, XXVI (1934), 234, j'ai été rangé à tort parmi ses adhérents. J'ai d'ailleurs déjà montré, sans que personne ne m'ait contredit, dans la *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XXXII, 118, n. 2, que la façon dont M. Grégoire envisage les relations qui existaient entre Dioclétien et Galère (et par suite les origines de la persécution dioclétienne), doit être rejetée. J'ai surtout déjà prouvé, *ibid.*, 117s., avec la dernière certitude tant contre MM. Schwartz, Grégoire et Caspar que contre Seeck, la réalité de la constitution de tolérance émise à Milan en janvier ou février 313, constitution qui est à la base de la politique inaugurée immédiatement après par Constantin vis-à-vis de l'Eglise d'Afrique et qui dépassait, sinon en substance tout au moins par son ton, dans un sens favorable aux chrétiens, l'édit de Sardique d'avril 311. Or, cette constitution de Milan montre irréfutablement qu'au début de 313 déjà Constantin était attaché à la politique religieuse que Licinius accepta, certes, dès la même époque, mais dont la pratique ne se laisse constater pour lui que quelques mois plus tard. Et plus on souligne l'identité matérielle de l'édit de Sardique avec le fond des dispositions prises à Milan, plus il faut ajouter au rôle que joua Constantin dans ses entretiens avec Licinius, à Milan: de fait, il était de beaucoup le plus puissant des deux et il était, de droit, seul détenteur du pouvoir législatif, outre cela il était le seul des deux immédiatement interessé à l'arrêté de Milan puisque dans le territoire de Licinius l'édit de Sardique était sans aucun doute en vigueur depuis 311. D'ailleurs, le fait qu'Ossius de Cordoue accompagna Constantin dans sa guerre contre Maxence, montre clairement qu'en 312 déjà Constantin subissait des influences chrétiennes de la plus grande force et qui n'avaient rien à voir ni avec la personne ni avec les intérêts politiques de Licinius.

Pour ce qui est de celui-ci, M. Grégoire croit qu'il s'est posé en 313, le premier, avec ostentation en champion du chris-

tianisme pour se gagner l'appui des sujets chrétiens, fort nombreux, du persécuteur Maximin Daïa qu'il allait combattre. Mais c'est un fait bien connu que l'armée romaine est restée presque tout entière païenne jusque dans la seconde moitié du IV^e^ siècle, et si, ainsi que M. Grégoire l'admet lui-même, le motif principal qui causa le déclenchement de la persécution dioclétienne a été le désir de satisfaire à l'antichristianisme farouche et sanguinaire des soldats, on ne voit vraiment pas comment dix ans après la raison d'état aurait pu dicter à un empereur, allant à la tête d'une armée essentiellement païenne à l'encontre d'une armée ennemie qui ne l'était pas moins, une attitude diamétralement opposée. Si l'on écartait avec M. Grégoire toute influence constantinienne, il faudrait s'attendre à ce que Licinius, sans se soucier, pour sûr, à la veille de la bataille de Tzirallum, des sympathies ou antipathies qu'éprouvaient les masses lointaines, désarmées et paisibles des chrétiens d'Asie et d'Egypte, aurait bien plutôt craint des répercussions fâcheuses que pouvait susciter dans l'esprit des soldats, tant maximiniens que liciniens, un acte public du culte chrétien de la part de l'empereur de l'Illyricum. Le fait que Licinius fit adresser par son armée la prière bien connue au dieu chrétien, ne s'explique donc pas autrement que si l'on admet, conformément au témoignage explicite des sources, qu'il agissait de concert avec Constantin, et probablement surtout impressionné, de même que ses troupes, superstitieusement par la fortune merveilleuse qui accompagnait les étendards de l'empereur pro-chrétien, sinon chrétien, d'Occident.

Ayant ainsi interprété et complété, dans la mesure du nécessaire, les observations contenues dans mon compte-rendu du tome I^er^ de M. Caspar, je puis à présent procéder à l'examen du tome II. Son chapitre I^er^ (pp. 10-81, 746-758) a pour sujet les successeurs de S. Léon le Grand jusqu'à la mort de Gélase I^er^, en l'amée 496, et les débuts du schisme acacien. M. C. surestime certainement l'importance de l'*Henoticum* par rapport aux relations de l'Etat avec l'Eglise, en y voyant la première manifestation retentissante du césaropapisme (p. 35). Il admet lui-même que ce n'était pas la première intervention extra-conciliaire d'un empereur en

matière du dogme, d'autre part, la différence entre un empereur qui impose sa volonté à l'Eglise en violant des conciles, comme le fit Constance II, et un empereur qui croit pouvoir se passer de tout concours conciliaire, est beaucoup moins grande que ne l'admet la conception, par trop formaliste, de M. C., pour ne pas parler du fait que l'*Henoticum* évitait de contredire ouvertement n'importe quel dogme de l'Eglise ou d'y ajouter quoi que ce soit. M. C. consacre plus de la moitié de ce premier chapitre au pontificat de Gélase Ier et à ses écrits. Soulignons la haute valeur des remarques (pp. 750s.) où M. C. discute, et détermine en partie, la date et l'authenticité de différents écrits gélasiens; il montre que le IIe Traité a été écrit entre la mort d'Acace et celle de Pierre Monge, et que peut-être toutes les lettres de Félix III ont été rédigées par Gélase. Le caractère quelque peu impérieux de ce pape, le fait qu'il fut un des promoteurs les plus énergiques de l'idée de la suprématie papale vis-à-vis du pouvoir séculier, ne manquent pas de s'imposer à notre auteur, influencé comme il l'est par la *machtanbeterische Ideologie*,[3] sans toutefois prévaloir sur ses préjugés anticatholiques. A la p. 48, l'usage du pape d'appeler "Eutychéens" tous les monophysites, est traité d' "insinuation", bien qu'il ne s'agisse là que d'une expression généralement employée dans le même sens par la terminologie catholique de l'époque, et donc aussi peu équivoque pour des lecteurs contemporains que le terme de "Nestoriens" quand il s'applique, dans des écrits monophysites, aux catholiques. M. C. méconnaît parfaitement les deux faits fondamentaux de l'histoire dont il traite, à savoir 1° que la politique des papes en matière dogmatique était, et est, dictée en premier lieu par leur devoir de veiller à la pureté du dogme, et 2° que leurs vues par rapport à l'hérésie monophysite (de toutes les nuances) étaient partagées dogmatiquement par l'énorme majorité des chrétiens de l'époque, et même par près des deux tiers des sujets immédiats de l'empereur byzantin; par suite, l'appré-

[3] Jusqu'à quel point M. C. ne voit en toute chose qu'une manifestation de force ou de faiblesse, cela est démontré par une remarque taxant de faiblesse un passage d'une lettre de Gélase Ier à l'empereur Anastase où les bonnes qualités morales que possédait l'empereur hérétique, sont loyalement reconnues (p. 73).

ciation de ce qui a trait, dans le livre de M. C., à ces faits, pèche par la base, et il n'y a pas lieu de nous arrêter longuement à chaque endroit où — comme c'est le cas pour Gélase Ier, par exemple à la p. 52 — cette conception fausse fait ses ravages.

M. C. soutient à bon droit (p. 53, 748s.) l'historicité, généralement niée, d'une expédition entreprise par Odoacre contre Rome pendant sa guerre avec Théodoric, mais il ne s'est pas aperçu qu'il faut sans doute la situer non pas, comme le crut Paul le Diacre, immédiatement après la défaite essuyée par Odoacre près de Vérone (et non pas de Ravenne, comme le dit M. C. par deux fois), mais seulement après que le double traître Tufa se fut de nouveau rangé du côté de son ancien maître. Pour résoudre la difficulté que présente la tradition au sujet de Festus et de Faustus en 490-493, M. C. propose avec beaucoup de vraisemblance (pp. 54 *in.*, 752s.) d'amettre que le second succéda au premier comme ambassadeur de Théodoric à Constantinople, mais que l'ensemble de leurs négociations à la cour impériale ne fut considéré que comme une seule ambassade.[4] Les énonciations de Gélase Ier par lesquelles il formula le premier la doctrine " des deux pouvoirs ", sont étudiées par M. C. avec un soin tout particulier et avec toute la sagacité qu'on lui connaît. Je n'estime cependant pas heureuse la façon dont il s'est inspiré, dans ses longues observations sur les termes *auctoritas* et *potestas* et sur le IVe Traité de Gélase (pp. 65-71, 753-758). De la littérature récente née de l'avidité avec laquelle certains philologues et historiens de l'antiquité classique se jetèrent sur le Monument d'Antioche dès qu'il fut découvert, pour tromper leur désœuvrement intellectuel, désœuvrement auquel ils sont forcés par la très grande difficulté de puiser encore dans nos sources de nouveaux renseignements importants sur l'histoire profane du Haut-Empire. J'ai dit, dans *Byzantion*, VIII, 211, ce qu'il fallait penser de la prétendue importance du fait qu'au mot ἀξιώματι du texte grec des *Res gestae divi Augusti*, correspond, dans le texte latin, le mot *auctoritate* et non pas *dignitate* (comme on le croyait auparavant). M. C., qui est étranger aux études

[4] Il faut toutefois avertir les lecteurs d'un contresens qui, par l'omission d'un mot, s'est produit dans la citation d'une phrase de Mommsen où il faut lire " *in neutro vocabulo* " au lieu de " *in vocabulo* ".

d'histoire ancienne, s'est laissé éblouir par la littérature dont je viens de parler, et, croyant qu'elle avait abouti à des résultats historiques de valeur, il s'évertue à utiliser et à compléter ceux-ci par une recherche semblable sur la terminologie dont se sert Gélase Ier. On ne s'étonne donc pas de voir que son résultat n'est pas plus satisfaisant que ceux de ses modèles. Sa thèse d'une distinction nette et profonde, au lieu d'une simple antithèse de rhétorique, entre *auctoritas* et *potestas* dans le célèbre passage Gelas., *epist.*, 12, 2, se trouve déjà singulièrement affaiblie par le fait, souligné dans un but différent par M. C. lui-même, qu'un ou deux ans plus tard le même pape appelle son pouvoir à lui et celui de l'empereur indistinctement *potestas utraque*. Cette thèse s'évanouit entièrement dès que l'on s'aperçoit qu'en aucun des endroits cités par M. C. où Gélase Ier emploie, en parlant du pouvoir séculier, le mot *potestas*, ce mot n'apparaît seul, mais qu'il y est toujours accompagné d'un complément déterminatif, tel que *saeculi* ou *regalis*. Il est donc presque superflu de rappeler combien le style du Bas-Empire aime à confondre, en les échangeant arbitrairement les unes contre les autres, des notions semblables, bien que différentes, et que l'empereur Anastase ne distingue même plus entre *potestas* et *imperium* (*Coll. Avell.*, no. 113, 1). L'excursus sur l'origine du titre de partriarche œcuménique (pp. 747s.) a déjà été signalé par M. Grégoire dans *Byzantion*, VIII, 570s., cf. aussi 73-76; cependant les observations de M. Collinet, dans son *Hist. de l'Ecole de Droit de Beyrouth* (1925), 167-172, si justement mises en relief par M. Grégoire, m'amènent à croire, à la différence de celui-ci, que le titre en question, appliqué, par son biographe, à un métropolite de Gangres qui avait été élu patriarche de Constantinople mais n'avait pas accepté cette élection, ne doit être considéré que comme une allusion panégyrique à cet épisode, et rien de plus.[5]

[5] L'année de l'avènement de l'empereur Anthemius est prise pour l'année de son décès (p. 14, n. 7); le second avènement de Zénon que Seeck a fixé à bon droit à la fin d'août 476, est daté d'après Günther et sans connaissance de ce qu'en a dit Seeck, des derniers mois de cette année (p. 16); le préfet augustal est appelé *exarque* ce qui, il est vrai, n'est peut-être qu'une faute d'impression pour *éparque* (p. 21, n. 6); la défaite, subie par Illus et son empereur Léonce en 484, est datée de 485 (p. 23); l'affirmation que ce n'est qu'à partir de l'époque d'Odoacre et de Gondebaud qu'on appelle, en Occident, les sujets de

Le chapitre II (pp. 82-192, 758-767) étudie l'époque allant de la mort de Gélase Ier en 496 jusqu'à celle de Jean Ier en 526. M. C. souligne à bon droit (pp. 760s.) que le tableau qu'il trace du procès du pape Symmaque, en partant du schisme Laurentien (pp. 87-117, 758-761), est en large mesure nouveau, mais nous ne saurions l'en féliciter. Car ce tableau repose entièrement sur la conviction de l'auteur que Mommsen a raison en situant les cinq premières sessions du synode chargé par Théodoric de juger Symmaque, en 501, la sixième et dernière au 6 novembre 502, contrairement à l'opinion solidement établie par Pfeilschifter, et corroborée par Sundwall dans ses *Abhdl. z. Gesch. d. ausgeh. Römertums* (1919), 96, d'après laquelle toutes les sessions se placent en 502. M. C. s'était rangé à l'avis de Mommsen parce qu'il croyait tout d'abord que les mots *pro diebus autem paschalibus* du *Fragment Laurentien* ne pouvaient se rapporter qu'à l'an 501, et qu'il était impossible que les Avienus qui furent consuls occidentaux en 501 et 502 eussent porté tous les deux l'épithète de *iunior*. Après que je lui eus démontré oralement la futilité de ces arguments, il les a remplacés par un autre qu'il tire des chapitre 109s. du *Libellus adversus eos qui contra synodum scribere praesumpserunt* d'Ennode et qu'il croit décisif, mais qui en réalité ne l'est pas du tout: car il est certainement permis, si l'on y regarde de près, de placer le *Libellus* d'Ennode vers décembre 502 et d'admettre, contrairement à ce qu'affirme M. C., que Laurent ne fit, sur le théâtre des troubles antisymmachiens, sa rentrée comme

l'empereur de Constantinople "les Grecs" ou "grecs" (p. 36, n. 2), ne tient pas compte de l'expression *Graeco imperatore* qui se trouve déjà dans Sidoine Apollinaire, *Epist.* I, 7, 5; M. C. ignore qu'il n'y eut pas de consuls d'Occident en 491 et 492, pas de consuls d'Orient en 494, et qu'au sujet de la nomination des consuls, l'arrangement définitif entre l'empereur et Théodoric advint en 497 (p. 54, n. 2). J'avais appris oralement à M. C. que, contrairement à la chronologie généralement admise, Acace est mort le 26 novembre 489 et Pierre Monge le 29 octobre 490, et je lui en fournissais en même temps les preuves que je publierai dans le tome II de mon *Histoire du Bas-Empire*; chez M. C., l'on trouve un mélange insoutenable de ma chronologie avec celle jusqu'ici en vigueur, de sorte qu'il date les décès d'Acace, de Pierre Monge et de Fravitas exactement d'une année trop tôt (pp. 41, 43, 750s.). D'autre part il date la déposition d'Euphème, à la p. 43, de l'automne 495, mais à la p. 44, n. 2, de l'an 496; la vraie date est celle du printemps 496 (voir Cyrill. Scythop. *v. Sabae* c. 50, *Eccl. Graecae mon.* III, 296C Cotelier).

antipape que plus tard, au cours de l'hiver. Etant donné que même l'hypothèse arbitraire de M. C. d'après laquelle l'évêque Pierre d'Altinum se serait trouvé à Ravenne ou à Rome lorsqu'il fut nommé visiteur de l'Eglise de Rome, ne permet guère de parquer entre le 25 mars et le 22 avril 501 tous les événements que M. C. assigne à l'intervalle entre ces deux dates, il n'y a qu'à maintenir la chronologie de Pfeilschifter et à rejeter celle de M. C., et même tout son exposé. Ceci est à souligner parce que M. C. déclare lui-même (p. 761) que c'est précisément sa prétendue réfutation de Pfeilschifter qui l'a amené à se former sur le pape Symmaque une opinion plus défavorable que celle des auteurs modernes, même protestants. Pour ce qui est de la personnalité de ce pape, aucun historien sérieux ne niera qu'elle ne semble pas avoir été des plus sympathiques, tandis que l'ignorance stupéfiante dans laquelle il laissa S. Avit de Vienne au sujet du schisme oriental, fournit à elle seule une grave présomption contre ses capacités comme chef de l'Eglise universelle, présomption que M. C. a d'ailleurs manqué de faire valoir. Mais de là à présenter Symmaque comme un rustre vaniteux et mesquin, comme le fait M. C., il y a loin; ce n'est pas par de telles raisons d'un ordre personnel que M. C. devrait expliquer le ton, beaucoup plus tranchant que celui de Gélase I^er^, dont Symmaque se sert vis-à-vis de l'empereur d'Orient, mais par les deux faits, qui lui sont pourtant connus, 1° que de 505 à 510 le royaume ostrogothique était en plein état de guerre avec l'Empire d'Orient tandis qu'à l'époque de Gélase l'empereur et le roi avaient été tous les deux à la recherche de l'accommodement auquel ils avaient abouti un peu plus tard, et 2° qu'à partir de 506-7 le monophysisme impérial se manifeste de plus en plus avec une violence bien différente de la modération relative qu'il s'était imposée au temps de Gélase I^er^.

M. C. est bien plus injuste encore envers le pape Hormisdas, successeur de Symmaque. A son avis la reprise des relations diplomatiques entre la cour de Constantinople et le Saint-Siège par suite de l'intervention de Vitalien, n'avait pas pour l'empereur un caractère aussi humiliant qu'on l'a cru jusqu'à présent. Il croit même pouvoir conclure de *Coll. Avell.*, nos 107, 109, que l'empereur réussit à séduire, à cette occasion, le pape, sans rencontrer

auprès de celui-ci la moindre résistance de principe, à la position d'un patriarche de l'Empire, exécuteur de la volonté impériale (pp. 131-138, 763s.). En réalité, cette thèse repose uniquement sur ses suppositions tacites: 1° que des questions religieuses qui, selon l'empereur, ont été mises à l'ordre du jour en Scythie, ou, si l'on préfère, ont donné lieu à des troubles provenant de cette province, doivent nécessairement n'avoir qu'un intérêt local, et 2° qu'un médiateur ne saurait être placé plus haut que les partis adverses. Il est inutile de prouver que ces deux suppositions sont inadmissibles; avec un peu moins de parti pris, M. C. se serait, en outre, certainement aperçu que le passage qu'il cite de *Coll. Avell.*, no. 116, et le témoignage de Théophane — que M. C. a tort de traiter à la légère puisqu'il remonte sans doute à Théodore le Lecteur — excluent formellement son interprétation arbitraire des mots *quae de Scythiae partibus mota sunt* et *in Scythiae partibus videntur esse commotae* dans les passages, également cités par lui, de *Coll. Avell.*, nos. 107, 109. Ce qui reste, c'est le fait qu'Hormisdas n'écarta pas d'emblée l'invitation à venir présider lui-même le concile qui devait se tenir à Héraclée Périnthe; mais cela a d'autant moins d'importance que ce concile n'a jamais eu lieu, les conditions posées par le pape n'ayant pas été remplies. Ne sachant pas encore que Euphème et Macédonius, patriarches exilés décédés tous les deux en 515, étaient morts, Hormisdas avait défendu en 516 à ses légats d'entrer en relation avec Timothée, successeur de Macédonius, quoi qu'en 517 il écrivit lui-même une lettre à celui-ci; bien que la raison de ce changement d'attitude soit patente, M. C. persiste néanmoins a croire qu'en s'adressant à Timothée, le pape fit preuve d'une prévenance considérable (p. 144). Ajoutons toutefois que M. C. lui-même reconnaît que, vis-à-vis d'Anastase, Hormisdas demeura *in der Sache fest* (p. 137) et qu'il observa lui aussi la *päpstliche Intransigenz*.

Par contre, M. C. se donne beaucoup de peine pour prouver que l'union qui termina sous Justin I^er^ le schisme acacien, ne fut nullement une victoire réelle de la papauté. La raison en est toujours qu'il est inconsciemment convaincu que la papauté n'attachait à la question du dogme pas plus d'importance que ne le fait M. C. pour sa propre personne. Ainsi, il voit une concession énorme (p. 153s.)

dans le fait pourtant si naturel qu'au sujet d'Acace d'une part, de ses successeurs défunts d'autre part, le pape se tint exactement à ce qui lui était prescrit par le dogme de la communion des Saints, en exigeant inébranlablement que *tous* fussent rayés des diptyques, mais en permettant, sans sortir des limites infranchissables tracées par ce dogme, que les noms des successeurs d'Acace — beaucoup moins coupables que celui-ci et dont deux, tout en étant schismatiques, avaient même souffert pour le dogme catholique — fussent passés en silence dans la formule de condamnation.[7] Dans son désir de diminuer le succès du pape, et même d'en faire presque une défaite péniblement dissimulée, il va jusqu'à prétendre qu'Euphrase d'Antioche aurait adopté *eine ziemlich eindeutig monophysitische Haltung* (p. 181) : il est, tout au contraire, certain qu'Euphrase était catholique (Malal., 416, 1s. B. Michel le Syrien, IX, 16, 20, t. II, p. 181, 190, Chabot) ainsi que le dit fort bien M. C. lui-même, sans s'apercevoir de sa contradiction, à la p. 149, n. 2. Aux pp. 184s., n. 3 (cf. aussi, p. 189, n. 3), M. C. nie que l'on puisse établir un rapport entre *Cod. Just.*, I, 5, 12, et les mesures de persécution prises par Justin I^er^ contre les Ariens (pp. 184s., n. 3; 189, n. 3); mais en réalité il n'est pas douteux que *Cod. Just.*, I, 5, 12, doit être daté avec P. Krueger du règne commun de Justin I^er^ et de Justinien (1^er^ avril — 1^er^ août 527), que le *principium* de cette loi fait allusion à une tolérance limitée que Justin I^er^ avait précédemment, sans doute à l'occasion de l'ambassade conduite par le pape Jean I^er^, accordée aux hérétiques, et qu'il est tout naturel que l'ordonnance de persécution, à dater selon toute vraisemblance de 524-5 et abolie par l'octroi de la tolérance limitée, n'a pas été reproduite dans le Code Justinien. Pour la chronologie du voyage de S. Jean I^er^ à Constantinople, M. C. se rallie à l'opinion de Duchesne (pp. 187-189, 769s., où il cite étrangement d'après sa traduction latine moderne un texte grec apocryphe du VII^e^ siècle); je dirai ailleurs pourquoi je crois avec Pfeilschifter et Sundwall que le pape quitta l'Italie dès l'automne 525. Contrairement aux sources, M. C.

[7] L'importance historique des différences que présente la tradition manuscrite du *Libellus Hormisdae*, différences soigneusement relevées par M. C. (p. 764s.), est médiocre.

fait entendre ou sous-entendre (p. 189) que le pape n'aurait pas obtenu de l'empereur ce qu'il s'était promis de lui demander, façon de présenter les choses qui permet à M. C. de faire du prétendu insuccès du pape ambassadeur — et non pas de son succès réel — la raison pour laquelle la colère de Théodoric s'abattit sur lui. — Les meilleures pages de ce chapitre me paraissent être celles concernant les relations qui existèrent pendant les premières décades du VI[e] siècle entre le Saint-Siège et la Gaule (pp. 124-128, 762). M. C. souligne à bon droit que le royaume des Francs ne subissait pas encore, à cette époque, la moindre influence directe du Saint-Siège. Il trace un tableau aussi succinct que complet de l'histoire de S. Césaire d'Arles autant qu'elle se rapporte à son sujet, et il fait la remarque, digne d'être retenue, que Sigismond représente un nouveau type religieux de prince, en tant qu'il est le premier roi germanique qui vint en pèlerin à Rome pour y vénérer S. Pierre et pour en rapporter des reliques (p. 127). Notons aussi l'intéressante discussion des différents vicariats apostoliques qui existèrent sous Hormisdas en Espagne (p. 765s.) où l'on voudrait cependant connaître l'avis de M. C. sur ce qu'a pu être à cette époque le vicariat espagnol conféré par Symmaque à S. Césaire (p. 126).[8]

Le chapitre III (pp. 193-305, 767-774) concerne tout entier

[8] L'avènement du patriarche Macedonius est daté de 495, au lieu de 496 (pp. 84, n. 3; 120); M. C. compte 72 au lieu de 66 évêques présents au synode romain de 499 (p. 89); bien que l'index du volume compte avec raison S. Pierre Chrysologue comme le premier évêque de Ravenne portant le nom de Pierre (p. 804), M. C. appelle Pierre II invariablement "Pierre III" (pp. 94; 111, n. 5; 112); Cassiodore est appelé, avec une exagération manifeste, le meilleur homme de son époque, et dans Cassiod. *var.* III, 20, 4, *M. G., Auctt. antt.*, XII, p. 90, le mot *nocere* ne dépend bien entendu pas des mots *notus ille artifex* qui le précèdent, mais du verbe *temptaverit* qui le suit (p. 114, n. 7); Elie de Jérusalem ne fut exilé qu'en 516 et non pas avant 513 (p. 121, n. 8); M. C. prend pour les troupes de Vitalien celles de la préfecture de l'Illyricum (p. 139, n. 6); il confond évidemment la légation de Festus de 490 avec celle de 497 (p. 141); il a une idée exagérée du nombre des *illustres* mentionnés dans l'adresse de *Coll. Avell.*, no. 153 en les prenant pour des "fonctionnaires supérieurs locaux" (p. 152, n. 1); à la p. 161, n. 1, lire "Avell. Nr. 167" au lieu de "187"; M. C. appelle Germanus le *frère* de Justinien (p. 164); il semble croire que la *damnatio memoriae* était une invention de Dioclétien ou de Constantin le Grand (p. 191).

l'histoire de la papauté sous le règne de Justinien Ier. M. C. donne un exposé très intéressant des courts pontificats qui se suivirent pendant la dernière décade de la domination gothique. Il est cependant inexact de dire que le rescrit d'Athalaric adressé vers 527 au clergé romain (Cassiod., *var.*, VIII, 24), aurait octroyé à celui-ci une exemption de la juridiction laïque dans une mesure jusqu'alors jamais atteinte (p. 195); en réalité ce rescrit ne fit que rendre toute sa vigueur, en la protégeant peut-être par une commination plus sevère (cf. Cassiod., *loc. cit.*, § 5), à une coutume ancienne (*ibid.*, § 2, *Const. Sirmond.*, 6), abrogée implicitement par Valentinien III le 15 avril 452 (*Nov. Valent.*, 35, *pr.* et §§ 1s.). Ce n'est que pour une raison difficile à concilier avec les règles de la grammaire latine que M. C. se range, contre Duchesne, Sundwall et Harnack, à l'opinion d'Ewald et de Mommsen d'après laquelle il ne faudrait pas distinguer un senatus-consulte, décrété en 532, de celui de 530 (p. 768). M. C. suppose à bon droit (p. 207, n. 5) que le passage où le métropolite Etienne de Larisse, dans sa supplique adressée à Boniface II, signale le fait qu'il avait été fonctionnaire subalterne d'un gouvernement de province, et contient une allusion à la raison pour laquelle il avait été déposé; mais alors il faut mettre cette déposition en rapport avec la législation impériale interdisant aux *officiales* l'accès à la cléricature, d'autant plus à l'épiscopat, et notamment à la loi *Cod. Just.*, I, 3, 52 (*pr.* et §§ 1-4), datée du 28 novembre 531, c'est-à-dire neuf jours avant qu'un synode romain ne fût saisi de l'affaire d'Etienne de Larisse. M. C. accepte, sans l'examiner, l'opinion courante sur la grandeur de Justinien Ier; néanmoins il ressort de son propre récit combien la politique religieuse de cet empereur était malfaisante et pitoyable. Même la faiblesse coupable par laquelle Justinien permit à Théodora de discréditer, précisément dans le domaine de la politique ecclésiastique et religieuse, le pouvoir impérial, même le fait, que l'empereur n'était en théologie qu'un amateur superficiel (p. 262), ne diminuent cependant pas l'admiration que ses actes inspirent à M. C.

On sait qu'en 521 encore le pape Hormisdas n'avait pas voulu introduire dans le *Credo* la formule du *Unus de Trinitate passus*, tout en reconnaissant son orthodoxie; ce n'est qu'en 533 que Jean

II accéda à la demande de Justinien d'approuver en bonne forme cette formule qui, superflue au temps d'Hormisdas, n'était pas inutile à présent où il s'agissait de repousser des tendances nestoriennes se manifestant parmi les moines de Constantinople. De cet état de choses, M. C. fait (p. 218s.) une importante victoire du césaropapisme sur la papauté, avec autant de droit qu'aurait un historien, animé d'une tendance opposée, à présenter l'affaire comme une victoire de la papauté sur le césaropapisme, et cela parce que, dans *Cod. Just.*, I, 1, 8, l'empereur lui-même fait du pape en quelque sorte le vrai législateur qui confirme la profession de foi impériale en lui donnant par là seulement toute sa validité (la forme inusitée de cette loi du Code Justinien n'a pas été dûment relevée par M. C.). L'intérêt qu'avait Justinien, à la veille de la guerre ostrogothique, à entretenir avec le Saint-Siège des relations aussi bonnes que possibles, interdit aussi de voir dans la novelle 11 du 14 avril 535, par laquelle Justinien créa l'archevêché de rima Justiniana, une infraction consciente aux droits du Saint-Siège que cette innovation ne touchait que très indirectement; sa portée pratique a d'ailleurs été bien mise en lumière par M. C. (pp. 209-211). Il en est de même du voyage d'Agapit I^{er} à Constantinople (pp. 221-228); mais M. C. ne s'est pas aperçu de la contradiction flagrante entre son affirmation (p. 225) que cela aurait été pour le pape le comble du triomphe s'il avait pu présider le concile constantinopolitain de 536, ce dont la mort l'empêcha, et le blâme sévère qu'encourt Hormisdas de la part de notre auteur pour avoir accepté en principe l'invitation de venir présider le concile d'Héraclée.

Les exploits et les déboires du pape Vigile sont racontés par M. C. avec beaucoup de compréhension, teintée d'un peu d'ironie pour ce caractère tortueux. Contrairement aux faits, M. C. prétend que le concile de Chalcédoine avait formellement reconnu l'orthodoxie de la lettre d'Ibas (p. 243), et que la condamnation des Trois Chapitres était inconciliable avec une profession de foi vraiment chalcédonienne (p. 255). Il suffit, pour la réfutation de ces assertions qui faussent naturellement dans une large mesure le récit de M. C., de renvoyer à Hefele, *Conciliengesch.*, II^2 (1875), pp. 905s. Etant donne: 1° que dans toute la querelle des Trois Chapitres il ne s'agit

nullement de la foi catholique formulée à Chalcédoine, qui est au contraire commune aux deux partis adverses, mais bien de la question, en soi d'ordre historique et non dogmatique, de savoir si certaines personnes et certains écrits appartenant à un passé déjà lointain, pouvaient être considérés comme catholiques ou non; 2° qu'aucun des anathématismes contenus dans le *Constitutum* de Vigile n'est en contradiction avec le concile de 553 et que tout le reste de ce document est clairement investi du même caractère de révocabilité qu'une résolution papale de faire une promenade ou de la remettre au lendemain; 3° qu'il n'est donc même pas nécessaire de faire valoir le fait que le *Constitutum* se présente lui-même comme le mémoire délibératif que l'empereur avait demandé au pape ou, si l'on veut, comme le vote conciliaire de celui-ci — étant donné tout cela, il est difficile à comprendre que M. C. croit que la rétractation du *Constitutum* et la confirmation du V^e^ concile œcuménique par Vigile prouvent l'inconsistance du dogme de l'infaillibilité (p. 274s., n. 4).

Un long excursus (pp. 770-774) nous apprend que nous ne connaissons pas de synodique papale d'avènement contenant une profession de foi qui serait plus ancienne que celle d'Anastase II et plus récente que celle de Zacharie, et que le concile œcuménique de 381, délibérément passé sous silence par le Saint-Siège encore en 485, mais reconnu comme tel, conformément au désir du patriarcat de Constantinople, par Hormisdas, est mentionné à partir de 534 par les papes dans leurs professions de foi; à cette occasion M. C. donne de bonnes raisons pour croire que le " Décret Gélasien " doit être considéré comme un ouvrage privé, antérieur à Hormisdas, mais retouché par un glossateur postérieur à Pélage I^er^. Le chapitre se termine par le récit du pontificat de ce pape. Disons encore que M. C. souligne à bon droit (pp. 234-238, 298-302) que le Saint-Siège se trouve au plus tard depuis 538 en relations directes avec la royauté mérovingienne, mais que son influence sur l'Eglise de Gaule est dès les pontificats de Vigile et de Pélage I^er^ singulièrement réduite par celle qu'entendent exercer les rois francs.[9]

[9] L'ordonnance du préfet Basile de 483 est par deux fois datée de 476 (pp. 196, 768); contrairement à ce qui est dit à la p. 199, Amalasonthe n' épousa

Les chapitres IV et V (pp. 306-402, 403-514, 774-778) forment une unité; bien qu'ils contiennent l'histoire des pontificats de Jean III, Benoît Ier, Pélage II et S. Grégoire le Grand, il constituent en quelque sorte une biographie de ce dernier, ainsi que le remarque M. C. lui-même, en en donnant les raisons (p. 306). La sympathie admirative que ce pape inspire à M. C. mitige considérablement son éloignement pour les idées dont S. Grégoire fut un si puissant promoteur. Pour peindre les différents éléments de l'évolution intellectuelle, dont la grande figure de S. Grégoire peut être considérée comme un aboutissement, M. C. donne d'abord de fort belles pages sur Denys le Petit (pp. 307-311), Cassiodore (pp. 311-314), le *Liber pontificalis* (pp. 314-320, 774s.) et la règle de S. Benoît (pp. 320-323, 775s.), où il ne croit pas devoir accepter les principales assertions de Chapman, *St. Benedict* (1929), tout en reconnaissant à ce livre une valeur réelle. La synthèse qu'il donne ensuite (pp. 323-339, 776s.) des conditions économiques et sociales telles qu'elles se présentent en Italie dans la seconde moitié du VIe siècle, et plus particulièrement le tableau

pas Théodat; à la p. 206 Cassiodore est appelé, par une exception qui pourrait induire en erreur, 'Senator'; le synode romain mentionné à la p. 208 ne siéga pas en novembre (*ibid.*, n. 3), mais en décembre 531; M. C. semble croire à une différence titulaire entre *illustres* et *magnifici* au temps d'Athalaric (pp. 219s.) tandis qu'à cette époque le mot *magnificus* n'était pas encore le déterminatif d'une classe de dignitaires différente des *illustres*; le père du pape Vigile a été préfet du prétoire sous Théodoric (Cassiod. *var.* IX, 7, 2), ce qui est plus intéressant que le fait qu'il reçut aussi le consulat honoraire (C. p. 229), probablement pendant le pontificat de son fils (cf. Sundwall, *Abhdl.* 131); l'expression "*sieben Hundertstücke Goldes*" (p. 229) n'a aucun sens, et doit être remplacée par "*700 Pfund Goldes*"; il est inadmissible de ne pas citer le *Bellum Gothicum* de Procope d'après Haury et d'après la subdivision des chapitres si pratiquement introduite par celui-ci, mais d'après Comparetti, ainsi que le fait M. C. (pp. 230, n. 5; 247, n. 5; 248, n. 3); le pontificat du pape Jean III ne doit pas être daté de 560-573 (pp. 236s., n. 7), mais de 561-574; Vitigès se rendit en 540 et non en 539 (p. 238, n. 1), et Teïa mourut en 552 et non en 553 (*ibid.*, n. 5); dans la bibliographie concernant Justinien Ier (p. 768) on trouve cité, non sans incorrections d'ailleurs, l'ouvrage à pu près inutil de W. G. Holmes tandis que le tres important tome II de Bury, *Lat. Rom. Emp.*[2] (1923) n'est pas mentionné; le pontificat de Silvère est par deux fois daté de 535-6 au lieu de 535-7 (p. 769); à la p. 772, lignes 6s., il faut corriger "Euphemius" en "Epiphanius"; le "*Stadtprätor*" mentionné à la p. 265 est naturellement le *praetor plebis* dont la fonction avait *été créée* en 535.

qu'il trace de l'administration domaniale et financière de l'Eglise romaine, est aussi plein d'intérêt. Il rend vraisemblable que vers 600 les dignités de *l'arcarius* et du *sacellarius* de l'Eglise romaine n'existaient pas encore, mais que les dépenses et les recettes du Saint-Siège formaient encore une unité administrative à la tête de laquelle se trouvait un diacre — sans doute, comme il nous faut ajouter, sous la haute direction du *vicedominus*, à moins que celui-ci n'existât pas alors de façon permanente. Deux corrections s'imposent toutefois à la p. 325: ce n'est pas seulement depuis Justinien que les évêques sont les personnages les plus importants pour toute l'administration municipale de leurs cités, et depuis que les gouverneurs de province étaient de fait placés sous la tutelle de deux redoutables subalternes, le chancelier et le canonicaire (ou tractateur), qui leur étaient adjoints par la préfecture du prétoire,[10] il coûtait assez peu au gouvernement impérial de permettre aux évêques et aux notables provinciaux d'élire les gouverneurs de province. L'histoire des pontificats qui s'intercalent entre la mort de Pélage I^er^ et celle de Pélage II est racontée dans le cadre que trace la vie de S. Grégoire avant son avènement (pp. 339-373); on y trouve des remarques fort judicieuses, bien qu'il me paraisse impossible d'appeler S. Grégoire avec M. C. un "*Lebenskünstler*" (p. 349). Pour montrer l'ignorance de S. Grégoire au sujet de l'histoire ecclésiastique d'Orient (p. 347), M. C. aurait bien fait de citer aussi le passage qu'il traduit, sans relever le fait, à la p. 373, où S. Grégoire ne sait évidemment rien de l'arianisme d'Eusèbe de Césarée. En traitant, non sans longueur, du schisme d'Aquilée, M. C. soutient encore une fois l'erreur manifeste d'après laquelle il y aurait contradiction entre les décisions, confirmées par le pape, du IV^e^ concile œcuménique et celles du V^e^; comme tant d'autres avant lui, il s'obstine (p. 370, n. 2) à ne pas voir la différence qui existe entre une décision du concile de Chalcédoine, et l'opinion qu'au cours de ses débats forme et exprime un légat romain sur un document, qui, ne faisant l'objet d'aucune décision du même concile œcuménique, sera condamné par le suivant.

[10] Voir ce que j'en ai dit dans ma *Gesch. d. spätröm. Reiches*, I (1928), 340s., 556; *Vierteljahrschr. f. Soz.-u. Wirtschaftsgesch.*, XXI (1929), 162s.; *Gnomon*, VI (1930), 411s.

Presque la cinquième partie de tout le volume est ensuite consacrée aux années 590 à 604 qui ne forment chronologiquement qu'à peine un vingtième de sa matière; il était impossible, j'en conviens, de réduire le récit de trois quart, mais on regrette cependant que M. C. ne se soit résigné, dans l'intérêt de l'économie de son ouvrage, à faire d'importantes coupures. On lira toutefois ses analyses, par endroits profondes, de la *Regula pastoralis* (pp. 378-383), des *Homiliae in Ezechielem* (pp. 383-386, 474-476) et *in Evangelia* (pp. 386-394) et des *Dialogi* (pp. 394-400) avec le même intérêt avec lequel on aura lu précédemment celle des *Moralia* (pp. 356-360), et on félicitera M. C. — félicitation toute relative, bien entendu — de ne pas se conformer, là non plus, à l'usage, aussi répandu que pernicieusement hypocrite, de glisser, en évitant la responsabilité d'un propre jugement, sur les choses les plus essentielles: ainsi il ne cherche pas (p. 399s.) à voiler son mépris pour la croyance catholique concernant les causes secondaires de la rédemption, et implicitement son incompréhension, sinon son ignorance, parfaite du rôle assigné dans l'épanouissement du dogme catholique à la *lex orandi*. D'autre part, on peut estimer qu'il y aurait eu lieu de donner sur l'activité de S. Grégoire concernant la liturgie des renseignements plus amples que ceux qu'on lit chez M. C. (pp. 405-407, 429, n. 4).[11] Ces remarques se trouvent au chapitre V, consacré tout entier à l'administration et à la politique de S. Grégoire, et presque uniquement basé sur le Registre de celui-ci; là surtout M. C. aurait pu abréger avec d'autant plus d'utilité qu'en somme, ce que son récit contient de substantiel et sûr, diffère beaucoup moins qu'il ne semble le penser, de ce qui a été dit, sous une forme avantageusement plus succincte, déjà en 1900 par mon maître L. M. Hartmann dans sa *Gesch. Italiens*, II, 1, chapitres IV-VI. Ce que dit M. C. au sujet de la formule 44 du *Liber diurnus* (p. 407, n. 1), a été affirmé d'avance par Hartmann, *Mitt. d. Inst. f. œsterr. Geschichtsforsch.*, XIII

[11] M. C. n'accepte encore que sous réserve, paraît-il, l'opinion du R. P. Mohlberg d'après laquelle le *Sacramentaire Grégorien* remonte à l'an 595, c'est-à-dire réellement à S. Grégoire. Mais le principal indice contre cette date me paraît être écarté depuis que j'ai montré, dans *Byzantion*, VIII, 730s., que l'Exaltation de la Sainte Croix était à Rome déjà en 569 une grande fête, célébrée, comme de nos jours, le 14 septembre.

(1892), 251s., n. 3, ce qui n'empêche pas M. C. de lui reprocher, en le citant, qu'elle lui ait échappé. M. C. soutient avec beaucoup de probabilité qu'il existait une certaine tension entre l'esprit monacal de S. Grégoire et l'esprit qui animait traditionnellement le collège des diacres romains (pp. 404-406), et il met particulièrement bien en lumière les derniers vestiges du vicariat de l'Illyricum qui disparurent dès avant le milieu du VII[e] siècle (p. 441 avec la n. 5), les relations de S. Grégoire avec la Gaule et avec S. Colomban que le pape ne nomme pas une seule fois dans ses écrits (pp. 493-504), et l'œuvre de l'évangélisation qu'il entreprit par la mission de S. Augustin en Angleterre (pp. 504-511), œuvre dont M. C. souligne éloquemment l'importance capitale et pour l'histoire des siècles suivants et pour l'ensemble de la politique grégorienne vis-à-vis des royaumes germaniques. Il a sans doute raison en disant (p. 504) que la politique gauloise de S. Grégoire était déterminée par ses visées anglo-saxonnes.[12]

La papauté au VII[e] siècle, plus exactement de 604 à 685, et à l'exclusion de ses relations avec le monde germanique, fait le sujet du chapitre VI (pp. 515-619, 778-785). M. C. rend vraisemblable que parmi les cinq premiers successeurs de S. Grégoire seul Boniface IV s'inspira de ses idées, les autres représentant les traditions réalistes et routinières du collège des diacres, et il suppose (pp. 515, n. 2; 518s.; 783-785) que dans le *Liber diurnus* les formules 58s. se rapportent, ainsi que l'avait déjà admis Friedrich, à l'élection de Sabinien en 604, les formules 60-63 à l'élection de Boniface IV en 607, de sorte que celui-ci déjà serait le premier pape confirmé dans sa fonction par l'exarque et non par l'empereur. Cette dernière hypothèse doit être rejetée. Outre qu'il serait difficile d'expliquer la longue vacance entre Boniface

[12] M. C. ne sait évidemment pas (p. 338) qu'un *scribo* est un officier supérieur placé sous l'autorité du *comes excubitorum* (voir Bury, *Imp. admin. System* [1911], 58s.); Hartmann n'a, bien entendu, jamais commis l'erreur que lui prête, en la commettant lui-même, M. C., de prendre des *palatini* pour des émissaires de la préfecture du prétoire (p. 777); par trois fois M. C. emploie (pp. 418, 420) le monstre linguistique "*Eure Gloriosität*" (au lieu de "*Eure Glorie*") pour traduire *gloria vestra*, expression bien connue comme titre qu'on donne aux dignitaires ayant rang de *gloriosi*; Pierre III de Ravenne est appelé Pierre IV (p. 428); la mort du Mérovingien Childebert II, advenue en 596, est datée de 595 (p. 496).

III et Boniface IV — l'élection s'étant faite, trois jours après la mort du pape défunt, à l'unanimité de tous les électeurs (form. 60s., pp. 51, 17; 52, 1s., 5s., 18; 56, 1-3 Sickel), et les relations du Saint-Siège avec l'exarque, tout comme avec l'empereur, étant à cette époque particulièrement bonnes — M. C. oublie, bien que Hartmann, *Mitt. d. Inst. f. œsterr. Geschichtsforsch.*, XIII, 246, en ait fait l'importante remarque, que les mots *propinquantium quoque inimicorum ferocitatem* de la formule 60 (p. 53, 3s. Sickel) — ne s'accordent pas avec son opinion: de 605 à 614 des armistices avec les Lombards paraissent s'être succédé sans intervalles ou à peu près, de sorte que la trêve de trois ans faite par l'exarque Smaragdus doit avoir commencé avant la mort de Boniface III, advenue le 12 novembre 607, l'armistice précédent ayant expiré en novembre 606.[13] D'autre part, les titres de dignités n'ont plus, dans les formules en question, la même valeur qu'elles avaient au temps de S. Grégoire le Grand et encore, d'après les procès-verbaux du VI^e^ concile œcuménique, en 681, puisque dans les formules 60s. un maître des milices vacantes porte le titre de consul (pp. 52, 12s.; 56, 7s. Sickel), et que surtout il n'y a plus de ducs qui ne soient pas *gloriosi* (p. 55, 18); c'est précisément à cause de cette dévaluation de l'(ex-)consulat et de la *gloria* que fut créée, entre 681 et 718, la classe nouvelle des protospathaires, comprenant les dignitaires de rang immédiatement inférieur à celui de patrice (voir plus bas p. . . .). Il faut donc dater les formules 60-63 du *Liber diurnus* d'une époque postérieure à 681 et même, à cause du passage sur la *propinquantium inimicorum ferocitas*, postérieur à l'irruption que fit vers 703 Gisulf de Bénévent dans le territoire romain, irruption qui doit avoir été la première infraction de la paix faite vers 680. Le pape Jean VI ne réussit pas à faire restituer par Gisulf trois villes que celui-ci venait de conquérir, mais il put au moins lui racheter les prisonniers qu'il avait faits. L'influence qu'exerçaient les papes sur les chefs lombards se montra de façon plus nette encore sous le pape suivant, Jean VII, auquel le roi Aripert II restitua vers 706 le patrimoine du Saint-Siège situé dans les

[13] Voir, pour ces armistices, Hartmann, *Unters. z. Gesch. d. byz. Verwaltung in Italien* (1889), 113s.

Alpes Cottiennes.[14] Le ton avec le quel le passage du *Liber diurnus* qui débute par la mention de la *propinquantium inimicorum ferocitas*, souligne que seul le pape, *ut omnibus notum est*, sait "mater" les Lombards — *aliquando monitis conprimit, aliquando vero et flectit ac morigerat hortatus* — semble bien contenir une allusion à ces événements encore récents qui doivent par suite être considérés comme *terminus post quem*. Le dernier parmi les successeurs de Jean VII dont l'élection fut ratifié par l'exarque, est Grégoire III qui doit être écarté parce qu'il avait été prêtre (*Lib. pont., v. Greg. III*, c. 1) tandis que l'élu des formules 60-63 du *Liber diurnus* est archidiacre; le premier, Sisinnius, peut être écarté également car ce fut un vieillard tellement débile *ut sibi cibum propriis manibus exhibere non valeret* (*Lib. pont., v. Sis.*, c. 1), de sorte qu'il n'est guère probable que trois mois et demi avant sa mort il ait pu exercer les fonctions d'archidiacre et faire espérer de sa part une activité efficace vis-à-vis des Lombards. Il ne reste donc que Constantin, élu en février 708, et Grégoire II, élu en avril 715. C'est donc de 708 ou de 715 que je crois pouvoir dater nos formules, en préférant 715 puisqu'il est possible que Constantin ait été prêtre, et qu'il n'est pas certain qu'il y ait eu un exarque à Ravenne en 708, tandis que Grégoire II nous est connu comme diacre dès 710 (*Lib. pont., v. Const.*, c. 3; *v. Greg. II*, c. 1), et que le *Liber pontificalis* (*v. Greg. II*, c. 7) nous le présente comme agissant, dans les premières années de son pontificat, envers les Lombards de Bénévent d'une façon exactement conforme à celle décrite par la formule 60 du *Liber diurnus*.[15]

Le récit de la crise monothélite jusqu'au synode de Latran de 649 (pp. 530-563) reprend, en l'élargissant, l'article important que M. C. publia sur ce synode dans la *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, LI (1932), 75-137. Il est parvenu sans peine (voir aussi, p. 595, n. 2) à réfuter le R. P. Grumel et M. K. Hirsch qui récemment

[14] Voir, au sujet de ces événements, ce qu'en dit M. C. à la p. 726.

[15] Il est d'ailleurs possible que le traité de commerce, conclu le 10 mai 715 entre le roi Liutprand et les gens de Comacchio (voir Hartmann, *Zur Wirtschaftsgesch. Italiens. Analekten* [1904], 74-78, 123s), n'a fait qu'accompagner un rétablissement de la paix entre Romains et Lombards du royaume après une guerre; dans ce cas, il serait tout naturel qu'à Rome on eût craint quatre semaines auparavant la *propinquantium inimicorum ferocitas*.

ont voulu faire du pape Honorius Ier un grand théologien, et il montre une fois de plus que ce pape, pour avoir été parfaitement orthodoxe quant à ses croyances, a néanmoins fait preuve, dans ses lettres, d'une maladresse insigne et d'une légéreté coupable. M. C. prouve aussi, par une recherche pleine d'originalité et de pénétration, l'importance, sous-estimée jusqu'à présent, du catholicisme graeco-paléstinien pour l'attitude observée par le Saint-Siège — auquel il fournit alors un pape en la personne de Théodore Ier — vis-à-vis de l'hérésie nouvelle pendant la décade qui suivit la promulgation de l'Ecthèse, et pour le synode de 649 dont les actes latins et grecs sont tous les deux originaux, les uns et les autres ayant été rédigés durant la session même. Toutefois, M. C. se contredit en prétendant, d'une part, que l'attitude de Théodore Ier vis-à-vis de la déposition de Pyrrhus aurait été d'une intransigeance rendant le conflit inévitable (p. 544), et, d'autre part, que S. Martin Ier l'aurait dans son procès représentée comme intransigeante contrairement à la vérité (546, n. 1); en réalité, Théodore était exactement aussi conciliant que le lui permettait son devoir de pape, le conflit, qui n'éclata que quelques années plus tard, aurait été évité si, à Constantinople, on avait abandonné l'hérésie, et S. Martin ne donne, en six mots, qu'un résumé véridique de la raison alléguée par Théodore Ier pour son refus provisoire de reconnaître la déposition de Pyrrhus. Je ne vois pas pourquoi il faudrait remonter jusqu'à Jules Ier, et non seulement jusqu'à Félix III, pour trouver une analogie aux anathèmes du synode romain de 649 (p. 559; cf. d'ailleurs M. C. lui-même à la p. 29).

Dans le récit des événements dont le point culminant furent les procès de S. Martin Ier et de S. Maxime le Confesseur (pp. 564-580, 779s.), l'assertion (p. 564) d'après laquelle l'instruction donnée par Constant II au nouvel exarque Olympius montrerait que l'action dirigée contre le pape était dès le début, comme concernant une matière purement politique, soigneusement distinguée des mesures relevant du domaine ecclésiastique, est basée sur un argument dont la futilité crève les yeux. Ne sachant pas que la pourpre est un privilège des empereurs et Césars, M. C. fait du bien connu Valentin — créé César par Constant II en 643 et assassiné

vers 645, après avoir renoncé à cette dignité l'année même où il l'avait reçue — un homme auquel Olympius aurait confié au plus tôt en 649, une haute fonction administrative en le revêtissant de la pourpre.[16] Ajoutons que déjà Hefele, *Conciliengesch.*, III² [1877], p. 236, avait fort bien vu de quoi il s'agit. Quant à S. Martin, si l'on examine attentivement l'argumentation par laquelle M. C. croit pouvoir établir que le pape ne fut pas le martyr de la foi que l'Eglise vénère en sa personne, mais simplement un conspirateur politique et puni comme tel, on remarque que la seule pièce d'apparence plus ou moins concluante contenue dans le dossier réquisitorial de M. C., est la déposition que fit au procès le patrice Dorothée; M. C. attache une importance particulière à cette déposition parce que, d'après lui, ce Dorothée n'aurait pas appartenu au groupe de gredins haut placés qui, compromis eux-mêmes dans l'affaire d'Olympius, firent de S. Martin leur bouc émissaire, mais il serait un témoin sincèrement indigne du pape et nullement en cause lui-même, étant donné qu'il aurait été patrice de la lointaine *Cilicie*. Mais les connaisseurs de l'histoire byzantine, tels que Hartmann (déjà dans ses *Unters. z. Gesch. d. byz. Verw. in Italien*, 117, l. 1), H. Gelzer et Diehl, sont unanimes pour lire, dans le passage qui nous occupe, *Siciliae* au lieu de *Ciliciae*, pour la raison patente qu'au VII[e] siècle la Cilicie, loin de former un thème indépendant dont le chef aurait pu être patrice, appartenait à la circonscription militaire dont le chef était le patrice et maître des milices d'Orient — stratège des Anatoliques. Dorothée était donc bien patrice de Sicile et non de Cilicie, et la valeur de sa déposition s'évanouit avec la raison pour laquelle elle est si hautement prisée par M. C. Pour la chronologie, les vues de M. C. sont identiques à celles de l'excellente étude publiée en 1928 dans les *Analecta Bollandiana* par M. l'abbé Devreesse dont il renforce sur un point l'argumentation. Il ne pouvait pas encore

[16] On lit dans la *Commemoratio eorum quae . . . acta sunt . . . in . . . Martinum papam, P. L.*, 129, 592D: . . . *Valentino, cum praecepto imperatoris* (sc. Constant II) *indutus est purpura et consedit ei* (sc. Constant II) . . . M. C. traduit ainsi: "*. . . Valentinus, als dieser mittels kaiserlichen Präzepts mit dem Purpur bekleidet ihm* (*Olympius*) *zur Seite sass . . .*", et il donne ce commentaire: "*D. h. von Olympius als Kaiser mit einem hohen Amt bekleidet wurde.*"

connaître la très précieuse *Vie grecque de S. Martin I^er^*, commentée et éditée de main de maître par le R. P. Peeters dans les *Anal. Bolland.*, LI (1933), 225-262; [17] son exposé aurait appris à M. C., entre autres choses, que le pape arriva le 1^er^ juillet 653 à Messine et non pas à Misène, et qu'il mourut non pas le 16 septembre 655, mais le 13 avril 656. Un certain Sagoleva qui vint, accompagné d'excubiteurs, au port de Constantinople pour faire transporter S. Martin à la prison, ne peut avoir été qu'un scribon et non pas, comme l'indique, sans doute par une erreur d'Anastase le Bibliothècaire, la *Commemoratio*, suivie par M. C. (p. 570), le *scriba*, fonctionnaire des tutelles et curatelles, à cette époque probablement encore subordonné au *praetor tutelaris* [18] et plus tard au questeur.[19]

M. C. fait entendre (p. 574s.) qu'Eugène I^er^ aurait passagèrement accepté en 655 une formule monothélite ou, si l'on veut, trithélite); cette insinuation est totalement injustifiée, ainsi qu'il ressort du propre récit de M. C. (p. 579s.; cf. Duchesne, *L'Eglise au VI^e^ siècle* [1925], 464s., 457s.). Dans le récit du pontificat de Vitalien, on lit avec regret que M. C. n'admet pas l'efficacité, en réalité admirable, de l'œuvre organisatrice d'Héraclius (p. 581), mais avec plaisir l'explication, aussi jolie que sûre, des *iudaica vincula*, jusqu'ici mystèrieux, dans Agn. c. 112, par la comparaison avec la formule 86 du *Liber diurnus* (p. 584, n. 7), et la remarque par laquelle il établit le fait intéressant que l'usurpateur Mezezius était, à la mort de Constant II, *comes obsequii* (p. 586).[20] M. C. raconte ensuite le VI^e^ concile œcuménique et les pontificats qui se

[17] Le mot ἐξερκέτῳ que nous lisons vers la fin du ch. 3 de cette *Vie* nous permet de corriger avec certitude au même chapitre (p. 255, l. 9) le mot ἐξάρχου en ἐξερκέτου, de sorte qu'il n'y a pas lieu de croire (*ibid.*, pp. 232, 234, n. 2), contrairement au témoignage formel du *Liber pontificalis*, que Calliopa n'était pas exarque en 653.

[18] Lyd., *de mag.*, II, 30; Bury, *Imp. Admin. System*, 76 se trompe en faisant du *scriba* un subalterne du *magister census*. Sur la survivance du *praetor tutelaris* de Constantinople sous Justinien voir aussi, Just., *nov.* 13, 1, § 1.

[19] Philoth., *cleterolog.*, p. 140, 10, 12; Bury = *De caerim.*, 717, 20 — 718, 1 B. *Ius Graecorom.*, I^s^ (Athènes, 1931), p. 220, Zachariae. Cf. Bury, *loc. cit.*

[20] La source à laquelle il puise ce renseignement, *J.-E.*, 2180, est un faux (voir plus bas, p. 156), mais il n'y a pas lieu de rejeter ce détail.

groupent autour de lui (pp. 587-619); soulignons l'intérêt de ses fines observations sur l'introduction de nouvelles formules dans l'usage de la chancellerie papale (pp. 591-593, 781s.), usage qui, tout en maintenant la liaison traditionnelle entre l'Eglise romaine et l'Empire romain, tient cependant compte de l'évolution par laquelle l'œcuménicité de l'Empire disparaît tandis que celle de S. Pierre s'affirme de plus en plus et la remplace: tandis que la coutume des papes, discontinuée, paraît-il, à l'époque de S. Grégoire, d'appeler les empereurs leurs fils, est reprise et étendue aux adresses même des lettres à partir de S. Martin au plus tard, l'Eglise de Rome est appelée pour la première fois par S. Léon II [21] *ecclesiarum omnium mater.* M. C. a raison d'assigner les prototypes des formules 73, 83-85 du *Liber diurnus* aux années 682-687, sans vouloir préciser davantage (pp. 616s., 783).[22]

Le chapitre VII traite de l'histoire de la papauté depuis l'avènement de Jean V jusqu'à Grégoire III, là aussi à l'exclusion de ses relations avec le monde germanique (pp. 620-668, 785-787). Les pages où M. C. évoque l'ambiance romaine dans laquelle se murent les papes syriens et grecques d'environ 700 (pp. 624-631, 785-787), sont à mon avis les plus attachantes de l'ouvrage tout entier.

[21] M. C. n'aurait pas dû omettre de mentionner le fait que le Missel romain célèbre Léon II liturgiquement comme Saint, et qu'il est le seul pape entre le premier et le septième Grégoire auquel cet honneur est rendu.

[22] M. C. croit à tort qu'à la veille de la querelle monothélite les luttes christologiques avaient cessé depuis cent ans (p. 529) et que le gouvernement impérial n'avait seulement pas reussi à incorporer *entièrement* les monophysites dans l'Eglise de l'Etat (p. 530). Heraclius-le-Nouveau-Constantin est appelé Constantin II (p. 543) bien que M. C. appelle ainsi, au tome Ier, à bon droit l'empereur qui mourut en 340. La conquête arabe de la Syrie doit être datée de 636 et non de 635 (p. 544); encore une fois nous rencontrons des "gloriosités" (p. 564); la date que M. C. suppose être celle de la mort de S. Martin (voir plus haut, p. 152), n'est pas le 26 septembre 655 (p. 572) mais le 16; M. C. reconnaît que j'ai établi la chronologie réelle des évêques byzantins de Ravenne et qu'il faut par suite dater le décès de Maur de 673 (p. 585, n. 2, cf. p. 523, n. 2), mais cela ne l'empêche pas de dater, à la même page, les épiscopats de Reparatus et de Théodore, suivant la chronologie ancienne et fausse, de 671-77 et 677-91 (lire: 92), au lieu de 673-79 et 679-93, et, à la p. 616, n. 1, la consécration de Damien de 692, au lieu de 693; enfin, puisque M. C. reconnaît à présent que la formule 82 du *Liber diurnus* doit être datée de 772 ou de 795 (p. 618, n. 3), il faut corriger deux fois, aux pp. 783, l. 31, et 784, l. 47, le chiffre LXXXII en LXXXIII.

De l'arrière-plan crépusculaire, caractéristique de l'époque et qui lui donne un attrait tout particulier, se découpent les ombres peu distinctes de ces papes byzantins et de culture supérieure à celle du milieu italien, d'un Jean VI par exemple qui, pendant une séance du synode romain de 704, interrompt les délibérations, latines bien entendu, pour plaisanter assez longuement, avec des synodaux, en grec, de façon à ne pas être compris par tout le monde; ou d'un Jean VII dont une mosaique nous a conservé le portrait et qui, fils d'un fonctionnaire supérieur de l'administration impériale de Rome, dédie à ses parents d'élégants poèmes tumulaires et se fait construire près de Ste. Marie Antique un palais à lui — peut-être, comme le suggère judicieusement M. C. (voir aussi, p. 637), pour se soustraire à l'influence grandissante de l'aristocratie autochthone romaine. Car le jour est proche où Rome secouera le joug byzantin et où la papauté se muera, en s'appuyant sur l'aristocratie locale mais aussi un peu la main forcée par elle, en champion de la liberté italienne, et l'heure a déjà sonné où, sous la superficie byzantine, la bureaucratie papale du moyen-âge achève de s'organiser, tout en devenant par son développement même un puissant foyer des forces locales. L'assertion de M. C. d'après laquelle Grégoire II aurait été, après Jean V, le premier pape sorti du collège des diacres (p. 624), est absolument arbitraire puisque nous ne savons pas ce qu'ont été Jean VI, Jean VII, Sisinnius et Constantin à l'époque de leurs élections; mais on trouvera chez lui des indications précieuses sur la *schola cantorum*, degré inférieur, et le *cubiculum Lateranense*, degré supérieur de la pépinière d'où sortent beaucoup de jeunes fonctionnaires du Saint-Siège, les fils de l'aristocratie romaine étant admis comme *cubicularii laici* au *cubiculum* du Latran et le service papal ayant donc remplacé, du point de vue social, les fonctions sénatoriales, éteintes au VI^e^ siècle. Dans la haute bureaucratie du Saint-Siège l'élément grec est, vers 700, sans doute encore plus fort que l'élément local qui l'évincera petit à petit au cours du demi-siècle suivant. Le développement de la bureaucratie est suivi de près par l'épanouissement et le rehaussement du cérémonial qui entoure la papauté notamment aux stations, ainsi

qu'en témoignent les plus anciens *ordines* romains.[23] On sait que ce cérémonial dérive en large mesure de celui de la cour impériale, de même que l'organisation administrative du Saint-Siège a été faite à l'instar de celle de l'Etat byzantin. Derrière le tableau extrêmement sommaire que trace M. C., on devine des problèmes capables de passionner l'historien des Institutions, problèmes dont l'étude n'est qu'à peine ébauchée. Nous sommes plus loin encore d'un " Droit public " de la papauté médiévale que d'un " Droit public " byzantin, et je ne saurais encore dire lequel des deux profitera plus de l'étude sérieuse de l'autre; on ne saurait donc que reprocher à M. C. sa brièveté en la matière.

Dans le récit des relations du Saint-Siège avec Justinien II et ses successeurs éphémères (pp. 631-643), M. C. croit pouvoir accuser le pape Constantin d'une attitude assez timorée dans la question du Quinisexte, et dire que toute cette papauté grecque de la fin du VII[e] et du commencement du VIII[e] siècle ait été lasse et sans élan (p. 642s.); mais si Jean VII semble mériter cette appréciation (cf. p. 637), la façon dont Constantin réagit contre le monothélisme de Philippicus Vardanès (p. 640s.), montre bien que lui ne la mérite pas, et l'énergie courageuse dont fit preuve Serge I[er] ressort de l'exposé de M. C. lui-même (p. 634s.). L'histoire que donne M. C. du pontificat de Grégoire II (pp. 643-664) s'inspire en partie des recherches magistrales de Hartmann, mais s'écarte de celui-ci considérablement en tant qu'elle se base sur l'article publié par M. C. dans la *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, LII (1933), 29-89. Cet article a déjà été réfuté dans *Byzantion*, VIII, 762-764, par M. Grégoire, qui a montré que Hartmann avait raison de considérer *J.-E.*, 2180, la première des soi-disant deux lettres de Grégoire II à Léon l'Isaurien, comme inutilisable pour l'histoire de la révolution italienne et de la querelle des images, et qu'il faut par suite rejeter les conclusions qu'en tire M. C. Quant à l'autre de ces deux lettres, *J.-E.*, 2182, on pourrait à la rigueur en admettre l'authenticité,[24] à condition toutefois qu'elle se place à

[23] Dans le passage cité à la p. 628, n. 2, le mot *archium* ou *arcum* des manuscrits signifie naturellement ἀρχῶν.

[24] Un indice *contre* celle-ci est la mention qu'elle fait d'un empereur Valentinien *le Grand*. Contrairement à l'avis de M. C. (p. 654, n. 4), il s'agit sans

l'époque où la révolution battait son plein, c'est-à-dire vers 727; mais il est en tout cas inadmissible de la placer avec M. C. à la fin de l'été 729 au plus tôt (p. 653s., n. 10), c'est-à-dire *après* que la coalition entre l'exarque Eutychius et le roi Liutprand eut mis fin, au cours de la 12e indiction (728-9),[25] à toute aspiration séparatiste du pape.[26]

En parlant de Grégoire III, M. C. met bien en lumière l'importance historique des mesures de Léon l'Isaurien par lesquelles, d'une part, les patrimoines du Saint-Siège situés en Italie méridionale et en Sicile furent tellement grevés d'impôts que cela revint plus ou moins à une confiscation de leurs revenus, tandis que, d'autre part, les provinces où ils se trouvaient et l'Illyricum furent détachés du patriarcat de Rome et rattachés à celui de Constantinople (pp. 665-668). Toutefois, M. C. me paraît surestimer la profondeur des

doute de Valentinien Ier et non de Valentinien III. Celui-ci, le *semivir amens* de Sidoine, a été généralement, bien qu'injustement, considéré comme tel par les générations suivantes et jusqu'à nos jours, et n'a, par suite, jamais été appelé "le Grand". Par contre, c'est précisément vers l'époque où un faussaire *grec* fabriqua au moins *J.-E.*, 2180, qu'un chroniqueur *grec* appelle Valentinien Ier par trois fois Οὐαλεντινιανὸς ὁ μέγας (Theophan., pp. 56, 23; 61, 25; 62, 5 de Boor), comme l'avaient déjà fait les chroniqueurs *grecs* antéliurs (Malal., 341, 14 B., *Chron. pasch.*, 562, 2 B.) tandis que parmi les chroniques *latines* le seul texte qui donne à Valentinien Ier l'épithète de *magnus* (Marcell. com. *ad a.*, 382, 1) a été écrit, lui aussi, en Orient. La légère incorrection (chronologique) de nommer Valentinien "le Grand" *après* Théodose le Grand, ne prouve certainement rien, mais se comprend plus facilement encore si ce n'est pas le pape, mais un faussaire grec qui l'a commise.

[25] *Lib. pont., v. Greg. II*, c. 22. M. C. donne lui-même deux fois (p. 727, lignes 8 et 25) la date de 728; je ne demande pas mieux, mais deux tiers de la 12e indiction appartiennent à l'année 729.

[26] Sur ce point aussi, je suis donc d'accord avec M. Grégoire, *loc. cit.*, 763, bien que je ne puisse pas voir avec lui dans tout cela un "brillant redressement opéré par Léon l'Isaurien". En tant que redressement, c'était plutôt piètre, tout dépendant de la bonne volonté de Liutprand qui, naturellement, n'agissait que selon son propre intérêt et ne se gêna pas pour empêcher l'exarque de sévir comme l'empereur le lui avait ordonné; ensuite il ne fallait ni de l'énergie ni de l'habileté pour désirer l'aide des Lombards, et pour l'accepter avec empressement dès qu'ils voulaient bien la prêter; *tertio*, rien ne prouve que cette coalition éphémère était, du côte byzantin, l'œuvre de l'empereur et non de l'exarque auquel notre source unique l'attribue; enfin, la création du thème de Rome qui, elle, est bien l'œuvre de Léon l'Isaurien, a certainement facilité la création de l'Etat pontifical sous Etienne II et s'est révélée si peu durable qu'elle ne mérite vraiment pas d'être glorifiée.

considérations qui amenèrent cette vengeance d'un empereur impuissant à punir autrement la papauté et le pape qui ne se pliaient pas à sa volonté en matière religieuse, de même que M. C. surestime certainement la grandeur du personnage tout entier (voir aussi, p. 644) : quel que fût le mobile qui poussa Léon l'Isaurien à déclencher la querelle des images — M. C. croit que c'était surtout le désir de faire des avances aux Pauliciens (p. 650) — un politique de l'envergure que lui prête M. C. n'aurait guère tardé à s'apercevoir que, du point de vue politique, il était en train de commettre une faute; d'autre part, la magnifique œuvre réorganisatrice que l'on attribuait jadis, ainsi que M. C. le fait sans doute toujours, aux Isauriens, a été accomplie en réalité par les empereurs du VII[e] siècle.[27]

Pour celui qui connaît les rouages de l'administration byzantine et les principes qui les régissent, la démonstration de Hartmann concernant le patrice et duc de Rome est de la dernière évidence, et M. C. a donc raison de l'accepter; [28] mais c'est en vain qu'il a cru pouvoir approfondir notre connaissance de ce sujet. Selon lui, il y aurait eu entre le *duc* de Rome de type ancien et le *patrice et duc* une phase intermédiaire, représentée par un *spathaire et duc* se distinguant du premier en ceci qu'il aurait été directement soumis au gouvernement central et non pas à l'exarque (p. 646, n. 3), sans être toutefois de rang égal à celui-ci; puis, l'ancien état de choses aurait été rétabli [29] pour être

[27] Voir, en dernier lieu, Ostrogorsky, *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XXX (1930), 394-400; *Byzantion*, VI (1931), 238-240.

[28] Les turmarques du IX[e] siècle (voir plus bas) n'étant même pas protospathaires, il serait inadmissible de croire avec M. Heldmann — dont M. C., dans la *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, LII, 66, mentionne, mais ne réfute pas — l'opinion qu'un duc subordonné à l'exarque aurait pu être patrice; quant à l'opinion de Crivellucci et de M. R. Holtzmann, d'après laquelle le patrice et duc Etienne aurait été, non pas un fonctionnaire impérial, mais un chef révolutionnaire, les légendes *grecques* de ses sceaux suffiraient à elles seules à la réfuter, ainsi que le dit M. C., *loc. cit.*, 67.

[29] Au moins faut-il supposer que telle est la pensée de M. C., puisque sinon il y aurait une contradiction par trop flagrante entre sa note 3 de la p. 646 et ce qu'il dit à la p. 667. Rappelons que c'est au plus tard en été 729 que Rome, la révolution ayant échoué, redevint impériale, donc au moins un an et demi (peut-être plusieurs années) avant la création du thème de Rome. Dans son grand ouvrage M. C. ne donne pas de date (approximative) pour

bientôt remplacé par la séparation définitive du duché romain, gouverné désormais par un patrice, de l'exarchat. Pour mettre les choses au point, il y a lieu de corriger tout d'abord une erreur de Hartmann qui avait cru (dans ses *Unters.*, 57, 155) que les exarques avaient le droit de nommer les ducs qui leur étaient subordonnés: nous savons que non seulement tous les ducs de l'époque justinienne mais aussi ceux du IX[e] siècle, appelés plus fréquemment turmarques, sont nommés par l'empereur; [29a] il faut donc admettre qu'il en fut de même pendant la période intermédiaire, et que les termes *ordinare*, *ordinatio* par lesquels Hartmann a été induit en erreur, ne signifient que l'installation (réelle ou non) dans la charge et non pas la nomination, tout comme l'*ordinatio* du pape ne se fait qu'après que son élection a été ratifié par le gouvernement byzantin (voir ce qu'en dit M. C. à la p. 784). Le fait que *Marinus imperialis spatharius qui Romanum ducatum tenebat* était *a regia missus urbe* (*Lib. pont., v. Greg. II,* c. 1), ne permettrait donc nullement de conclure à n'importe quel changement dans l'organisation administrative de Rome, même s'il était lui-même le duc, ce que M. C. croit d'autant plus volontiers que le *Liber pontificalis* parle immédiatement après d'un autre spathaire qui vint à Rome après que Marinus eut quitté la ville. Mais étant donné que ce second spathaïre était investi, M. C. le reconnaît lui-même, d'une mission spéciale, on est, au contraire, porté à croire que ni lui ni Marinus n'ont été ducs de Rome; car à côté de Marinus, pendant l'action duquel l'exarchat était vacant, nous trouvons un duc Basile — qu'on prendra plutôt pour le duc de Rome que pour celui de la Tuscie suburbicaire ou de la Campanie—,[30] et les pouvoirs de commissaires spéciaux de l'empereur

l'activité des spathaires impériaux à Rome; dans la *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, LII, 67, n. 106, il assigne la mission de Marinus approximativement (" *in eben dieses Jahr etwa* ") à l'an 727, mais cette date est absolument impossible, l'exarque Paul étant venu en Italie quelque temps avant l'ordonnance iconoclaste de 726, et la présence du spathaire Marinus à Rome se plaçant quelque temps avant l'arrivée de Paul en Italie, donc au plus tard en 725 et très vraisemblablement plus tôt (cf. Hartmann, *Unters.*, 21s., 125s.).

[29a] Voir Hartmann, *loc. cit.*, 70s., 163, cf. 75, 154.

[30] C'est-à-dire de la Campagne de Rome, le pays de Naples formant sans doute déjà à cette époque un duché différent qui sera rattaché par Léon l'Isaurien au thème de Sicile.

prévalant toujours sur ceux de l'administration régulière, le passage du *Liber pontificalis* peut simplement être interprété dans ce sens que Marinus agissait en maître dans le duché de Rome. Quant au titre de spathaire, il est intéressant de le voir apparaître ici deux fois de suite, vers la même époque pour laquelle le *proto*-spathariat comme classe de dignitaires (et non comme fonction) est attesté pour la première fois par Theophan., p. 398, 7 de Boor; l'existence de cette classe, immédiatement inférieure au patriciat, ainsi que l'existence, au moins probable dès la même époque, de la classe des spatharocandidats, montre que même si Marinus et l'autre spathaire de la *Vie de Grégoire II* devaient être considérés comme des ducs de Rome, il serait invraisemblable qu'ils n'eussent pas dû ressortir de l'exarque, le spathariat étant de trois degrés inférieur au patriciat,[31] et les turmarques du IX^e^ siècle étant soit également spathaires, soit même spatharocandidats.[32] M. C. n'a d'ailleurs pas vu (p. 667) que le *ducatus Romanus*, placé sous un *patricius et dux*, est aussi territorialement autre chose que ne fut le duché de Rome au début du VIII^e^ siècle: celui-ci n'avait été, selon la terminologie plus récente, qu'une " turme " du grand " thème " d'Italie, tout comme les autres duchés; celui-là est lui-même un thème au chef duquel les ducs de Campanie, de Tuscie suburbicaire (Nepi) et de Pérouse, continuant de faire fonction de turmarques, sont subordonnés (cf. Hartmann, *Unters.*, 66, 161).[33]

Le chapitre VIII (pp. 669-740, 787-793) qui est le dernier, étudie les relations entretenues par la papauté, depuis la mort de

[31] Voir Bury, *Imp. Admin. System*, 26s., cf. 22s.

[32] *Tact. Usp.*, *Byz.-neugr. Jahrb.*, V, 141, nos. 139s., Beneševič. Philoth., p. 151, 4s., 7, 10, 12, 34, Bury = *De caerim*, 734, 2-11; 735, 3 B.

[33] L'ordination de l'archevêque Félix de Ravenne est datée de 708 (p. 637) au lieu de 709; le successeur (immédiat) de Jean VII n'était pas Constantin (p. 638) mais Sisinnius; l'édit de religion de Philippicus Vardanès n'était, bien entendu, pas monophysite (p. 640), mais monothélite; l'empereur Anastase II ne s'appelait pas Philasthenius avant son avènement (p. 641), mais Artemius, et l'exarque qu'il envoya en Italie ne s'appelait pas Scholasticus (*ibid.*), mais Scholasticius; la question difficile concernant la chronologie de Théophane et résolue par M. Ostrogorsky, provenait d'une divergence entre les années du *monde* et les indictions, et non pas, comme le croit M. C. (p. 644, n. 2), entre celles-ci et les années de *règne* des empereurs.

S. Grégoire jusqu'au milieu du VIII[e] siècle, avec l'Espagne, l'Angleterre, les Francs et la Germanie, avec les Lombards enfin, le récit concernant ces derniers débouchant dans l'histoire générale de la papauté sous Grégoire III et Zacharie. La partie concernant l'Angleterre (pp. 676-690, 788s.) me semble particulièrement bien réussie. C'est en réalité l'histoire entière de l'Eglise anglo-saxonne au VII[e] siècle, contemplée sous la perspective romaine; notons seulement les remarques (pp. 677s., 688s., 788) par lesquelles M. C. prouve la romanité intégrale de S. Wilfrid dont la piété diffère par là considérablement du culte naïf voué par les rois anglo-saxons à S. Pierre. Passant ensuite sur le continent, M. C. traite (pp. 690-723, 789s.) de l'œuvre d'évangélisation qu'accomplirent, depuis Serge I[er] jusqu'à Zacharie, des missionnaires, surtout anglo-saxons, en Germanie, en tout premier lieu S. Boniface dont l'histoire est racontée avec force détails. Le plan de Grégoire II, qui aurait voulu organiser une Eglise d'outre-Rhin aussi étroitement liée au Saint-Siège qu'indépendante du pouvoir séculier, échoua, d'après M. C., par suite de la maladresse du pape Zacharie qui misa sur la mauvaise carte, en appuyant le duc de Bavière dans sa révolte contre les fils de Charles Martel au lieu de s'intéresser à temps à la réforme de l'Eglise franque entreprise par Pépin le Bref. Cette conception me semble un peu arbitraire, mais il serait difficile de la réfuter; par contre, il faut taxer au moins de légéreté le passage (p. 714s.) où M. C. accuse Zacharie, sans l'ombre d'une preuve et en contradiction flagrante avec les données de notre seule source (*J.-E.*, 2271), d'avoir envoyé, sans en informer S. Boniface, un évêque en Bavière comme chef de l'Eglise bavaroise, et d'avoir ensuite désavoué et sacrifié ce malheureux, avec une vilenie rare, en félicitant S. Boniface de l'avoir traité en imposteur. Après quoi, M. C. suppose tout aussi gratuitement mais avec d'autant plus d'aisance, que l'attitude du pape par rapport au conflit de S. Boniface avec Virgile de Salzbourg aurait également été louche (p. 720).

En revenant sur le théatre byzantino-lombard, M. C. présente cette fois carrément la capitulation de Grégoire II comme un succès du pape (pp. 727, 730), et c'est sans doute aussi son

admiration pour Grégoire II, admiration basée sur ses prétendues lettres à Léon l'Isaurien, qui lui fait juger si défavorablement, en l'appelant *unzeitgemäss*, la politique de Grégoire III, le dernier pape syrien, et surtout de Zacharie, le dernier pape grec (pp. 735-738, 740). En réalité, la politique de Grégoire III et de Zacharie a été absolument conforme à celle qu'avait poursuivie Grégoire II pendant les deux dernières années de son pontificat, et que continuera encore Etienne II pendant les deux premières années du sien.

Dans la *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, LII, 67s., n. 107, M. C. maintient son opinion d'après laquelle le patriciat dont Pépin fut investi en 754 par Etienne II, aurait été, contrairement à l'avis de Hartmann, autre chose que la dignité byzantine de patrice (qu'elle ait compris ou non le gouvernement du thème de Rome). Il est amusant de voir tous ces historiens de marque, formés dans l'ambiance des *Monumenta Germaniae*, outre M. C., aussi MM. Eichmann, Heldmann, R. Holtzmann, peut-être d'autres encore, discuter avec le plus grand sérieux sur les termes de patrice romain, de patrice des Romains et de patrice tout court, tout en étant d'accord pour prétendre que celui de *patricius Romanorum* est quelque chose de nouveau, soit qu'il faille l'appliquer déjà au patrice et duc Etienne du temps de Grégoire III et de Zacharie, ou que l'on doive le considérer comme une formule créée expressément pour Pépin, ainsi que le prétend M. C. En réalité, le fait que le titre de *patricius Romanorum* est donné à des exarques par des auteurs écrivant aux VII^e^ et VIII^e^ siècles,[34] devrait suffire pour prouver que la titulature patricienne de Pépin ne permet d'aucune façon de distinguer son patriciat de celui des fonctionnaires byzantins; mais puisque ces témoignages ne sont pas considérés comme concluants — parce qu'ils ne proviennent pas de source byzantine et qu'on y interprète le mot *Romanorum* comme étant employé en opposition aux Francs ou aux Lombards — il importe de signaler le fait qu'à Constantinople, d'après l'" actologie " officielle concernant la promotion au patriciat, le nouveau patrice s'entend adresser, tant par les κράκται des Verts

[34] Fredeg., IV, 69; Paul. Diac., *hist. Lang.*, IV, 38. Au X^e^ siècle encore, le *Chron. Salern.*, c. 2, *M. G., SS.*, III, 471 *ex.*, appellera le dernier exarque *Romanorum patricius*. Cf. Hartmann, *Unters.*, 136s.

qu'ensuite par ceux des Bleus, l'acclamation protocolaire: καλῶς ἦλθες, ὁ δεῖνα πατρίκιε τῶν Ῥωμαίων [35] — et cette fois on ne dira ni que le complément déterminatif est employé pour certifier qu'il s'agit bien d'un dignitaire byzantin, ni qu'il désigne au contraire, ainsi que l'exigerait la thèse de M. C., Pépin le Bref et ses successeurs. Non, ce sont bien les *codicilli patriciatus* de Byzance que Pépin reçut du pape auquel Jean le silentiaire les aura à cet effet remis de la part de l'empereur; en soi, cet événement n'avait d'ailleurs rien de sensationnel, car Charles Martel avait possédé la même dignité, et cela — M. C. le dit incidemment lui-même (p. 700, n. 1) — dès 724 (*J.-E.*, 2168), donc à une époque où, personne n'en doute, seul l'empereur avait pu la lui conférer. Le patriciat byzantin étant une ἀξία διὰ βραβείου, il n'impliquait nullement une ἀξία διὰ λόγου telle que la fonction de gouverneur d'un thème, l'exarchat ou le duché (patricien) de Rome, par exemple; mais les détenteurs suprêmes du pouvoir séculier en Italie ayant été depuis un siècle et demi les seuls patrices résidant dans le pays, et ni l'exarque ni le patrice et duc de Rome n'existant plus, il n'est pas surprenant que la dignité, légitimement acquise, de patrice impérial ait servi à voiler une usurpation de pouvoirs par les rois francs, commise aux dépens de l'Empire et en majeure partie au profit de l'Etat pontifical naissant. Quant au changement que subit la politique d'Etienne II, loyalement byzantine jusque vers la fin de 753, il faut à mon avis l'attribuer à la nouvelle que les légats du pape venaient de rapporter de Constantinople (cf. *Lib. pont.*, *v. Steph. II*, c. 17), à savoir que l'empereur avait décidé de faire revivre la querelle des images, terminée par Artavasde et jusqu'alors nullement renouvelée par Constantin V; ce n'est que le 10 février 754 [36] que se rassembla le conciliabule d'Hiéria.[37]

Le dernier chapitre se termine par une table synoptique des évêques, prêtres et diacres qui participèrent aux synodes romains de 721, 731, 743 et 745 (pp. 790-793); elle montre que le prin-

[35] *De caerim.*, 253, 8s., cf. 254, 5-7 B.

[36] Voir Ostrogorsky, *Byz.-neugr. Jahrbb.*, VII (1930), 15, 39s.

[37] Ce n'est donc pas " au point culminant de l'iconoclasme, en plein concile d'Hiéria ", comme dit M. Grégoire dans *Byzantion*, VIII, 764, qu'Etienne II demanda des troupes à l'empereur.

cipe d'ancienneté régissait l'avancement tant dans le collège des prêtres que dans celui des diacres, et que ce dernier subit dans l'espace d'une décade de très forts changements.[38]

Si le tome II de l'ouvrage entrepris par M. C. est nettement inférieur au tome I^er^, la raison en est sans doute que M. C. avait consacré plusieurs années à l'étude de la période antique de la papauté avant de se mettre à en écrire l'histoire, tandis qu'il n'a pas cru devoir s'initier pareillement à la période byzantine. Mais nous nous plaisons à ne pas oublier qu'à côté de grandes faiblesses, le tome II contient, lui aussi, des pages belles et fécondes.

ERNEST STEIN.

The Catholic University of America.

[38] A la p. 720, ligne 17, il faut lire "744" au lieu de "739"; rien n'indique que la première occupation de Ravenne par les Lombards, advenue entre 731 et 735, ait duré environ trois ans; en 743, l'archevêque de Ravenne n'était pas Jean VII (p. 735), mais Jean VI; Artavasde ne se fit pas proclamer empereur en 741 (p. 739, lignes 4 et 22), mais en 742.

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE IN MARYLAND*

Some twenty years ago, after considerable research among records apparently unknown or neglected, I was preparing to write a history of Virginia, first of the original thirteen colonies; but there intervened the catastrophe of the World War, and the work was laid aside. After the close of the war, I was persuaded, in view of the approaching Tercentenary of the State of my adoption, as well as ancestry, to take up a study of Maryland. At the time I thought its story had been worked out; and I was not particularly interested in rewriting an exposition already adequately presented. In view of my terrifying ignorance of the subject, I do not yet understand why I had been commended to the publisher who wished me to undertake the effort. Vaguely I had *commonsensed* that there was merit in certain unique or unusual claims made by Marylanders, however much they had been denied by others, especially with respect to priority in establishing one of the three great principles that lie at the basis of our form of federal government; but I was not on intimate terms with the original records upon which any such claim might be based. The first question I asked myself was: If the Maryland claim be true, how does it happen that it has not been universally accepted? Immediately my interest was aroused; for a point in controversy, if at all significant, invariably excites in me an ardent desire to get it settled. As I began work, the thought arose that if my humble decision in the matter should be against the Maryland claim, I could at least, in so large a country, find a harbor elsewhere until the storm was over. There is an advantage in State lines; for instance, from the earliest times, Marylanders have sought refuge in Virginia; and *vice versa,* Virginians in Maryland.

Again, George and Cecil Calvert were indistinct personalities, to whom I attributed no special purpose other than that of finding a refuge in America, not unlike the much advertised "Pilgrims"

* Paper read at the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, December 28, 1934, Washington, D. C.

and Puritans. To be sure, these groups had found such a refuge, with the glorious privilege of "worshiping God according to the dictates of their own conscience," but they had incontinently and ingloriously refused the privilege to others. In that respect the government they set up in the New World was no better than those in Europe of which they had complained.

Before consulting official archives and source material, I perused innumerable monographs, patriotic and educational addresses, and sundry volumes that claimed for Maryland the earliest establishment in America of religious liberty. On the other hand, I found that outside opinion, briefly but firmly expressed by the historians of other States and of the United States, presented almost a unanimous verdict to the contrary. In fact, one noted American historian wrote both ways. Referring to his first rendition, Marylanders quoted him as a Daniel come to judgment at the shrine of Clio! Outlanders, however, quoted the later editions; and, if they knew about his earlier opinion, they would point to the change as the result of subsequent study—a correction, if you please, even though the reversal of the verdict was not accompanied by visible confession of error.

Having cited the confusion of this distinguished American historian of international reputation, I would now illustrate the situation with an incident at home. In the Maryland gubernatorial campaign of 1926, one of the major political parties prominently promulgated a plank in its platform to the effect that the party whole-heartedly reaffirmed the noble principles of religious freedom laid down in the immortal Toleration Act of 1649; and that their candidates were pledged to confirm the Act and enforce its mandates. It was evident that the platform-makers prided themselves greatly on that ringing pronouncement! No doubt the jealousy of their rivals was aroused to the point of kicking themselves vigorously in that they had not thought of it first!

It was natural for statesmen actively engaged in seeking the suffrage of fellow-citizens to select passages that had been culled by patriotic scribes; they would hardly have the time to read the original law in its entirety. They would, therefore, refer to those parts of the Act which refer to the evils flowing from "the inforc-

ing of the conscience in matters of religion" and the great desirability for all to live at peace and harmony, and that no citizen should even call another by any name or in any way that would be considered objectionable, in any matter pertaining to religion. In short, it was plain that these parts of the Act had been conceived and set forth in a fine spirit of godly inspiration and human brotherhood.

However, there was unexpected balm for the political party that had, apparently, missed a rare opportunity. A Baltimore newspaper allowed space on its editorial page in which a student of history asked certain questions as to this reaffirmation of the "Act Concerning Religion"—which is, of course, the original title of the enactment. He asked the nominees if, upon election, they really would carry out their promises; for this particular plank in their party platform had pledged them to hang Dr. William H. Welch, internationally distinguished scientist at large and President of the local University Club, and confiscate his property; to say nothing of proceeding in similar fashion against other Unitarians, Jews, and all who did not accept the doctrine of the Trinity. Quite an undertaking, but nevertheless that was what the reaffirmation of the so-called "Toleration Act" required! Quoting the words of the Act—that portion which Maryland chroniclers have preferred to leave unsung, we read:

> Bee it therefore ordayned and enacted . . . that whatsoever person or persons within this province and the islands thereunto belonging, shall from henceforth blaspheme God, that is, to curse him, or shall deny our Savior Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, or shall deny the Holy Trinity, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, or the Godhead or any of the sayd Three Persons of the Trinity, or the Unity of the Godhead, or shall use or utter any reproachful speeches, words or languages concerning the Holy Trinity, or any of the sayd three persons thereof, shall be punished with death, and confiscation or forfeiture of all his or her land and goods to the lord proprietary and his heires.

Although Woodrow Wilson was no professional historian, he wrote an extended history of the United States that is distinctly above the average in power of analysis. He recorded the sweeping nature of the Maryland claim and then proceeded to expose the element of error in it by reviewing the Act as a whole and

citing the intolerant, as well as the liberal, passages. In so doing, Professor Wilson was perfectly logical, as far as the provisions of the Act were concerned. He was merely another one of the historians of the entire country who did not, or could not, take the time to investigate the multitudinous records in the archives of each of the States.

From this it will be seen that no greater blunder could have been made than the attempt to lift the "Act Concerning Religion" out of its proper relativity—if I may use a recent term of high science—ignoring its manifest limitations, and eulogizing it as the original chart or charter of freedom of conscience in Maryland and America. To borrow a popular phrase, it may be asked: How did Marylanders get that way? Heaven only knows! Although some one interested in evolving "notes for the curious" could probably find out when and where the idea originated. It would be interesting to know the patriotic but mistaken soul who first called the restrictive enactment of 1649 "The Toleration Act."

With the whole picture of this early colonial period in view, this apparently paradoxical piece of legislation constituted a compromise between the liberal practices of the colonists or founders prior to its passage and the intolerance of the element that was about to seize complete control during the Cromwellian interregnum. When Lord Baltimore and the original founders, regardless of faith, regained command, the Act was quietly buried through repeal, only to have parts of it, a hundred years or so later, resoundingly resurrected and the whole given a patriotically improvised but nonetheless fictitious title. In other words, this law of the General Assembly of Maryland marks the *first definite instance of interference* by the colonial government in matters pertaining to religion. Under the circumstances, it was not only not an announcement of a glorious policy of freedom; but, in some of its provisions, it offered a definite foretaste of a period of wholesale restrictions imposed by the incoming Puritan group, who proceeded to seize the government and denounce not only what they called "papacy" and "prelacy", namely, Catholics and Anglicans, but also any ideas, creeds, or customs that did not conform to their peculiar tenets.

To illustrate the contrast, it may be noted that during the period ushered in by the Act, the Puritan government had, under its terms, brought the Jew, Jacob Lumbrozo, before their court and put him in jeopardy of his life. Before the trial was completed, however, restoration was at hand. With restoration came repeal; and a few years later we find this same Lumbrozo sitting on a jury of the province.

All of this seems simple when once understood; but what an amazing amount of confusion has resulted from what may be called misplaced emphasis. The research worker holds in his hands the exceedingly dangerous power of suppression. The temptation to use this power is so great, in order to gratify preconceptions or prejudice, or even a wish to shirk the labors of further research, that it has become the earnest belief of the writer that no one should undertake to pass upon any controversial subject without discussing his conclusions, or tentative conclusions, with individuals of varying, different, or divergent sympathies.

The laudations of the "Act Concerning Religion"—in particular the renaming of the enactment, together with the neglect of the true basis for Maryland's just claim to distinction—will perpetuate error for some time to come; for our text-books have taken up these misconceptions and are passing them on to successive generations of school children. Under the caption, "The Maryland Act of Toleration," the author of a high school history of the United States, a distinguished professor in one of our largest universities, inculcates this teaching: That in order to protect his co-religionists, Lord Baltimore was obliged to "pass the famous Toleration Act." This authority then adds that although the Maryland law was

> the first such act on the statute books of the American colonies, we should remember that Roger Williams, thirteen years earlier, had founded Rhode Island on principles of religious toleration more complete than those of the Maryland Act.

It would be hard to find a better example of a perfectly correct statement leading to a completely erroneous conclusion. The name of the author might be given but for the manifest injustice in singling him out for the commitment of an error common to

many others. His text-book is selected because it is said to be more widely used than any other.

It is not the purpose of this paper to draw comparisons, which may, or may not, be considered invidious; but Maryland was founded in 1634, Rhode Island in 1636. From the first, Rhode Island, liberal far above her sister colonies of New England, did not welcome into the body politic two classes of religionists that were not questioned in Maryland. In the words of Roger Williams, citizenship was granted "to such as the major part of us should admit into fellowship with us." In Maryland, during the rule of the proprietary, political privileges were, on the contrary, not limited by religious predilections. Again, while there may be no record that Quakers were actively discriminated against in Rhode Island, it is a fact that Wenlock Christison, driven out of Massachusetts and seeking asylum in Rhode Island, tarried there only a short time. From Rhode Island he came to Maryland, where he took up his abode on an estate appropriately named "The End of Controversie."

Discussion of the so-called "Toleration Act" is especially pertinent, for it is manifestly impossible to consider the separation of Church and State in Maryland without first taking into account its complement or corollary, freedom of conscience. The "Act Concerning Religion," having become the best advertised event in the colonial history of the province, the incident and the argument arising therefrom offer a natural approach to our theme.

Beside this bootless boasting and rebuttal, there is found an immense mass of discussion concerning a phrase in Lord Baltimore's charter, which was said to indicate an intention of involving Church and State, the one with the other. With regard to this point, some of the wranglers maintained that the provision was a subtle subterfuge preparatory to the eventual establishment of the Faith maintained by Calvert; others argued that, properly interpreted, it prepared the way for an Anglican endowment in the Baltimore palatinate. Between these extremes there were perhaps a dozen variations. The matter has been happily settled by the discovery in the Maryland archives of the record of the examination of Father Francis Fitzherbert, S. J., who presented

a simple and lucid exposition of that which had wrinkled the brows and taxed the intellects of countless commentators.

The original phrase of the charter, repeated in somewhat different terms in an early act of the General Assembly, was a general statement as to the rights and privileges of the Church in the province. Here is the Fitzherbert reply which was admitted, or vouched for, by the provincial court:

> By the very first law of this Country, Holy Church within this Province shall have and enjoy all her rights, liberties, and franchises wholly and without blemish; amongst which that of preaching and teaching is not the least, neither imports it what Church is there meant.

It is now in order to review what brought about the establishment of a government having no connection with ecclesiastical pronouncements and where the consciences of its citizens were free from dictation by the State.

The founding of Maryland represents the fruition of an idea or ideal that persisted throughout the ages, from the writings of Lactantius to the accomplishment of the Calverts. Everyone is familiar with the story of St. Thomas More's *Utopia*, where a law was made

> that every man might be of what religion he pleased, and might endeavor to draw others to it by the force of argument and by amicable and modest ways, but without bitterness against those of other opinions; but that he ought to use no other force than that of persuasion, and was neither to mix with it reproaches nor violence.

George Calvert, a scholar capable of reading "The Land of Nowhere," in the original Latin, must have been familiar with the story of the ideal state set forth by St. Thomas More, since Calvert's spiritual counsellor was Father Henry More, a great-grandson of the English Chancellor. He also must have been familiar with the long-forgotten sentiments of Edward Aglionby, member of Parliament for Warwick in 1571, who, even while Elizabeth was prosecuting recusants and dissenters alike, boldly declared that there should be no human positive law to enforce conscience, and that

> the conscience of man is eternal, invisible, and not in the power of the

greatest monarchy in the world, in any limits to be straightened, in any bounds to be contained, nor with any policy of man, if once destroyed, to be again raised.

Just as in the seventeenth century religious liberty was indissolubly linked with the separation of Church and State and *vice versa,* so the character of George and Cecil Calvert, respectively the projector and the founder of Maryland, must be taken into account with a view to understanding their aims. If either or both of the Calverts had by their conduct in other matters shown themselves to have been avaricious, crafty, or cruel, then their acts and aims with regard to the founding of Maryland might well be regarded with suspicion; but none of these unfavorable terms agrees with what is actually known of them. On the contrary, what we are able to gather, through sources both hostile and friendly, indicates that they were ambitious, yet fair; liberal, yet prudent; and always inclined to be charitable even in the midst of great and continuous provocation. A study of their lives, relationships, and achievements inspires respect and admiration. In short, the thought is unavoidable that they were idealists reaching for reality; and the fact that, in order to achieve their prime purpose, they were willing to make any material sacrifice makes us feel that they firmly believed in certain principles which they sought to put in practice in advance of the age in which they lived. Since no one may pass positively upon the motives that sway the actions of human beings, it is proper to look for documentary evidence; but, in an age of censorship, documents are doubtful guides. There is no expression, for instance, in the Charter of Maryland looking towards the separation of Church and State or any promises held out in the matter of freedom of conscience. Neither George Calvert, who is supposed to have prepared the Charter, nor Charles I, who sanctioned it, would have dared to announce, in cold type as it were, any such purpose. Rather, it is fair to assume that they had to give color to an opposite view, lest Parliament, uniting with the Anglican or Established Church, should overthrow not only the project and its projector, but the monarch himself.

Viewed from the historical angle, one of the best addresses

made during the Tercentenary exercises on the site of the first Capital of Maryland was a brief one delivered by Father J. Eliot Ross, Chaplain of the Society of the Ark and the Dove. In my opinion, everything Father Ross has ever written on Maryland history, (or at least everything I have ever seen), has been fundamentally sound. I can do no better than to quote from passages in his address bearing upon this matter:

> March 27, 1634, the day on which the first pilgrims of Maryland formally established their settlement at St. Mary's City, marks a turning point in the history of the world. For although in the beginning there was no specific legislation or charter provision, as in Rhode Island (1636) and in Pennsylvania (1681), the colony actually applied the distinctively American principles of separation of Church and State and religious freedom for all. These Maryland settlers started a bloodless revolution that has since been triumphant in most of western civilization.
>
> Indeed, so firmly entrenched have these principles become, that it is difficult for us now to realize how different was the situation in the early seventeenth century. Then the idea that the State must officially be united to some particular Church, severely limiting the rights of non-conformists, was universally accepted, and it had the sacred sanction of the custom of centuries. *Cujus regio ejus religio* was an unquestioned maxim of jurisprudence. According as they had the power, Catholics persecuted Protestants, Protestants persecuted Catholics, and the various branches of Protestants persecuted one another. About the only thing in which all Christians united was in a common animosity against the Jews.

Mention of March 27, and emphasis thereon, brings to mind that Maryland's claim to fame and world distinction would be facilitated had the State or its people elected to celebrate March 27 instead of the 25th. It was a common custom on landing to have religious services. That may be said of all the colonies, whether Spanish, French, Portuguese, or English, whenever they had such landings; but only one had civil ceremonies only in connection with the establishment of the government. That one was Maryland.

We may go further at this point and take this opportunity to clear up still another remarkable misapprehension as to the founding of Maryland. It is of less importance than that concerning the "Act Concerning Religion," and yet it has had its share in producing confusion. March 25 was not the date of the first

landing, as universally believed. Also, it could not have been the date of the first religious service; for I cannot imagine several previous Sundays having passed in Maryland without some sort of religious observance. March 25 was a particularly notable day in the Church calendar and also the first day of the old style year. The date naturally loomed large in the narrative of our first historian, the ever careful Father Andrew White, who himself records the actual first landing on an unmentioned date some time before under circumstances not altogether ideal when some of the women, being rowed ashore to do the washing, were responsible for upsetting the boat and the consequent loss of much of his linen.

Nevertheless, this is how one Maryland historian of comparatively recent authorship opens his narrative, *The Beginnings of Maryland, 1631-1639:*

> The twenty-fifth of March is the day on which the first colonists sent out by Lord Baltimore landed on the soil of Maryland.

Already we have noted the incident of the upset boat; and no one has questioned the fact that two days later the provincial government was formally established at St. Mary's approximately thirty miles down the Potomac river.

So, if the first landing took place on March 25, the date generally accepted and definitely set by Dr. Steiner, this is what the colonists would have had to do in the forty-eight hours between the two events, all of which is recorded in Father White's *Relatio* as having happened after entering the Potomac on March 5: the incident of the overset boat at the first landing; an unsuccessful call upon the Indian chief at " Potomac Town "; an extended conference with the Piscataways farther up the river; the building of a shallop constructed with lumber brought over on the *Ark;* the construction of temporary protection against possible attack; and the erection of a cross with attendant services, besides other details such as the re-embarkation and journey down the river to the site chosen for permanent habitation. I submit that if all this were done in two days, the pioneers of Maryland were several times as fast as the fastest workers on record.

Probably there is no hope or expectation of any official or un-

official change in the celebration of Maryland's birthday; but I offer the thought in the sincere belief that if we had given, or if we should give, greater heed to the day upon which the government was founded in a way that established a world-precedent, Maryland would come into her own so much the sooner. The thought has a definite bearing upon our theme; and it may be added that one group—the Society of the Ark and the Dove—has ever celebrated the 27th as the anniversary significant of the distinct glory of colonial Maryland.

If it be contended that Cecil Calvert was actuated by mercenary or commercial motives; or that, being a Catholic subject under a Protestant monarch, he was compelled to separate Church and State, we could not dogmatically deny the charge, however unfair and untrue it seems. On the other hand, if it be contended that he was actuated wholly by altruistic ideals, that, too, cannot be gainsaid with assurance. After extensive study, I should say that idealism was uppermost in the purpose of the Calverts; but, being also practical, they held in view the hope of a profitable enterprise. If it were not profitable, it would not be practical; and if not practical, the ideal as well as the reality would be lost.

The fact remains that, under Calvert's guidance, apparently with royal approval, the functions of Church and State were separated in Maryland; and it seems almost equally demonstrable, by what actually happened, that accompanying this separation there ensued in the province the highest measure of religious tolerance then enjoyed in any part of the Christian world. In the words of Father Ross: "It meant the first government under which Catholics and Protestants lived harmoniously with equal civil rights." If, at any time, any restrictions were placed upon freedom of conscience, these were not prescribed by Lord Baltimore but were forced upon the province, as in the case of certain parts of the "Act Concerning Religion" of 1649. In fact, it seems clear he would have preferred no formal legislation of any kind relative to matters of religion.

When the colonists set out, they were given instructions by Lord Baltimore to avoid disputation as to religion. They were not even to call each other perfectly legitimate names, such as

Presbyterian, Puritan, or Jesuit, if the calling of these names should be done in a manner to give offense—one of the most remarkable provisions one may find in history, a provision that became incorporated in the liberal half of that paradoxical enactment of 1649. Again, it was directed that the offices of the Church—and we may interpolate Father Fitzherbert's phrase—"*any church*"— were to be done privately. Hence, there was no provision for religious rites or ritual in the exercises prescribed by Lord Baltimore in the establishment of the government at St. Mary's City, the first capital of the Calvert Palatinate. In that age, and under the circumstances, this omission was politic and may not be interpreted as anti-religious or irreligious, because the Lord Proprietor was particularly solicitous that religious consolation should be supplied through the immediate construction of a chapel. This first consideration for the well-being of the soul was coupled with instructions for the equally prompt erection of military defenses as a protection for the physical welfare of all concerned.

Incidentally, it seems that all the colonists, at one time or another, were permitted the use of the chapel; nevertheless, a temporary lock-out of an illiberal element by a Catholic layman and wealthy contributor was punished by a council composed of Catholics; and so it happens that in the Province of Maryland, a real sanctuary for representatives of all forms of faith, there is no record of any prosecution or persecution because of any religious belief, or lack of belief. This is negative evidence as to procedure that to me seems equivalent to documentary proof. On the positive side, the only recorded instances of litigation as to matters of religion resulted in the imposition of penalties on those who sought to interfere with the practice—the unheralded but accepted practice—of religious liberty.

And this sweeping statement applies to the entire period when the control of the government was in the hands of the founders, Catholic and Protestant, under the guidance of the Lord Proprietary. It definitely ended when William and Mary took over the province and the Anglican church was set up in Maryland as the instrument of the State. Thereupon Maryland, in the matter

of religious liberty, descended nearly to the status of the old world governments and contemporaneously below those of Holland, Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania, to rise approximately to its pristine level at the time of the American Revolution.

Finally, with reference to the statement as to documentary evidence, the impression should not be given that such evidence relative to the purpose of the Calverts and their associates is wholly lacking; for example, I would quote a significant passage from a private letter of that colorful colonist, soldier, philosopher, commentator, and statesman of the Province, Captain Thomas Cornwallis. Addressed to Lord Baltimore, it contained the following passage:

> Your Lordship knows my security of conscience was the first condition I expected from this Government.

Summing up, from what actually took place, the evidence of the establishment of religious freedom is overwhelming, whilst the absolute fact of the separation of Church and State in the Province of Maryland is positive and irrefutable.

MATTHEW PAGE ANDREWS.

THE PALATINATE OF DURHAM*

In the Charter of Maryland we read that the king granted to Lord Baltimore all the "rights, jurisdictions, privileges, prerogatives, royalities, liberties, immunities, and royal rights, and temporal franchises whatsoever, as well by sea as by land, within the region, island islets, and limits aforesaid, to be had, exercised, used and enjoyed, as any bishop of Durham, in our kingdom of England, ever heretofore hath had, held, used, or enjoyed, or of right could, or ought to have, hold, use or enjoy."[1] With this rather exact statement, we are directed quite definitely to the history of the palatinate of Durham if we would discover what was the nature of the grant made to Lord Baltimore.

The term "palatine" (*palatinatus*) had been used on the continent from Merovingian times to denote an official of wide and general powers who was closely attached to his sovereign and who was very influential, one to whom were entrusted almost kingly powers; in fact, he was the very expression or the projection of the regality. In the centuries following the Conquest, the power of the Earl of Chester and of the Bishop of Durham had risen to such heights that it was thought possible to describe them only by employing the title that was used on the continent to designate an official whose powers were indefinite and hence of unlimited possibilities—the *comes palatii.*

Although the practice was somewhat unusual, still it was good feudal theory that a sovereign could attach to any grant of land that he made to his feudatories such parts of the *jura regalia* as he saw fit, even to the extent of royal power, provided he retained the sovereignty himself.[2] Outside the kingdom itself these grants were called kingdoms, principalities, duchies, etc. Thus, in 1307, Edward II granted the Isle of Man to Anthony Bek, Bishop of Durham, as a kingdom. Henry IV made the same grant to the

* Paper read at the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, December 28, 1934, Washington, D. C.

[1] Charter of Maryland, Art. IV, cited in Scharf, *History of Maryland*, I, 53.

[2] Gaillard T. Lapsley, *The county palatine of Durham*, 3 ff.

earls of Northumberland, and with the same title, as did Henry VII to the Stanleys. But when such powers were granted within the kingdom, they were usually designated as counties palatine. Durham, Chester, and Lancaster were well known as such during the middle ages.[3]

The story of the origin of the Durham palatinate—a mooted question—need not detain us. It contains the fine tradition that the beginnings of the possessions and privileges of the See are to be found in the grants made in 685 by Egfrith, King of Northumbria, to St. Cuthbert when the latter became Bishop of Durham —grants that were later confirmed and enlarged by Alfred and Guthred the Dane and later still confirmed and enlarged by William the Conqueror.[4]

While historians have much fault to find with the successive steps in the story as outlined, no one questions the fact that before the Conquest the Bishops of Durham enjoyed from the munificence of successive benefactors, extended territorial possessions, fortified and protected by the most ample privileges and immunities. And while historians hold that it was not until 1293 that the term *palatinus* was first applied to the Bishop of Durham, it is also evident that from a very much earlier time, in most cases from the Conquest, the bishops were using the same powers and prerogatives that they used after the title had actually been conferred upon them.[5]

Much of the evidence in regard to the origin of the palatinate and to its early years throws so much light not only on the nature of the palatine state but on the powers and prerogatives of the bishop as they were used and accepted at the time that it is worth while to examine it.

Bacon, in his essay on government, says:

> Counties-palatine were certain parcels of the kingdom assigned to some particular person and their successors, with royal power therein to execute all laws established, in nature of a province holden of the Imperial Crown:

---

[3] John Thomas Scharf, *History of Maryland*, I, 60.

[4] The question of the origin of the palatinate is thoroughly discussed in the *Victoria county history of Durham*, II, 138 ff.

[5] Robert H. Surtees, *The history and antiquities of the county palatine of Durham*, I, xv.

And therefore the king's writ passed not within this precinct, no more than in the marches. These were occasional from the courage of the inhabitants, that stoutly defended their liberties against the usurping power of those greater kings that endeavored to have dominion over the whole heptarchy, and, not being easily overcome, were admitted into composition of tributaries; and therefore are found very ancient.[6]

In a document of Elizabeth's reign, this statement occurs: "Every earl-palatine created by the King of England, is a lord of an entire county, and has therein *jura regalia*; which *jura regalia* consist of two principal points, *viz.*, in royal jurisdiction, and in royal seignory. By reason of his royal jurisdiction, he has all the high courts and officers of justice which the king has; and therefore this county is merely disjoined and severed from the crown as is said in the case of the duchy. . . . So that no writ of the king runs thither, unless a writ of error, which being the dernier resort and appeal, is alone excepted out of all their charters." [7]

When Bishop Anthony Bek was called before Parliament to give an account of his conduct of affairs, to which Edward I had objected, his counsel made the point that the Bishops of Durham "had from ancient times, *omnia jura regalia et omnes libertates regales infra libertatem Dunelmensem a tempore conquestus et antea.*" [8] In a Northumberland *Coram rege* roll of 46th Edward III, there is a plea of Thomas, Bishop of Durham, to an information against him for contempt in not certifying a record, in which the bishop states:

Quod ipse est comes palatinus et dominus regalis cuiusdam terrae vocatae le bishoprique de Duresme, et habet omnia jura regalia quae ad comitem palatinum et dominum regalem pertinet, per se justiciarios et ministros suos exercenda.[9]

In the case of Hern *v.* Lilburn (Arg. 1, Bulst, 160) one of the arguments set forth stated that:

[6] Cited in William Hutchinson, *The history and antiquities of the county palatine of Durham*, I, 120-121.

[7] *Ibid.*, I, 120 n.

[8] Selden, *Titles of honour*, 641.

[9] Northumberland *Coram rege roll* 42, 46th Edward III.

Before the st. 27th Hen. VIII, the Bishop of Durham was as a king, and might pardon all matters, and had *jura regalia*, but that statute took away part of it. Treasons, felonies, murders, were pardoned by the bishop, he hath his judges, and they have their fees from him; and in writs of trespass, the writ is of trespass done *contra pacem episcopi*. All this was before the stat. of Hen. VIII.[10]

"Thus the Bishops of Durham," says Raine, "continued for many centuries to exercise their high privileges in these their northern territories. They appointed Sheriffs and Constables, their Justices of Assize and Gaol Delivery, their Escheators, Coroners, Foresters, and Bailiffs. They held their Inquisitions *post mortem*; had their Courts of Wards and Liveries; and in short in no one single respect were they or their men amenable to the Crown, except in cases of public necessity or public danger; and even then a solemn pledge was given by the reigning King that no precedent should be established which might at a future period become prejudicial to the interests of Saint Cuthbert and the Church of Durham." [11]

When Henry II sent his justices of assize to the county on an extraordinary occasion of murders and robberies, he declared by his charter that he did it with the license of the bishop, and for this occasion only, and that his act should not establish a custom either in his time or in the time of his heirs, since it was an act of genuine necessity; and that he wanted the palatinate to enjoy its ancient liberties and customs as it had always done.[12]

From these pieces of information (the number might be increased greatly) two things are quite evident: first, the fact that the Bishops of Durham not only held but exercised exceedingly large rights and privileges which gave them a great spirit of independence; secondly, that they held and exercised these rights from a very early time. The many rich endowments which were given the bishops from time to time since the days of St. Cuthbert

[10] Hutchinson, *op. cit.*, I, 120 n.

[11] James Raine, *The history and antiquities of North Durham*, 7.

[12] Hutchinson, *op. cit.*, I, 239; John S. Bassett, *Constitutional beginnings of North Carolina* (In vol. 12 of *Johns Hopkins University studies in historical and political science*), 22.

would imply many consequences in regard to their temporal position.

The vicinity of Scotland, then an active and vigilant enemy of England, as well as the disturbed state of the northern province, which had always been restless under the Norman yoke, demanded the presence there of a power that would be capable of acting in an emergency with vigor and promptitude. And it is easy to see the motives that would incline a monarch to select for this important trust an enlightened ecclesiastic, appointed by and attached to the crown, in preference to a hereditary noble, less easily conciliated and already possessing a dangerous share of local influence. It was always taken for granted that a palatine would never think of aspiring to a strong central power because its head was an elective mitre rather than a hereditary prince.

A third cause for the spirit of independence in the palatinate was that after the Conquest there grew up in the north a feudalism far more complete than anywhere else in England. The Bishop of Durham was the chief feudal lord in the whole northern area, a circumstance which gave him immense importance in that region.

Owing to the reasons just enumerated, the bishops assumed the position of authority bestowed upon them and provided both the organization and the executive power that the position demanded as head of the civil government, as chief feudal lord, and as head of the judiciary. It may be well here to enumerate his powers, in part at least, in order to give some idea of the great variety of affairs with which he was concerned and to show the extent of his jurisdiction.[13]

As head of the civil government, he had the appointment of all civil officers; this included all the officers that the king would ordinarily appoint for a complete government organization. He was served by a chief administrative officer, officials to preserve the peace, a treasurer, chamberlains, and a chancellor. He had a number of knights—at one time they numbered one hundred and forty—a set of household officials, and a group of judicial officers. In addition, there was developed in the course of time a council

[13] Hutchinson, *op. cit.*, 126-127, 254, 290.

to aid in the general administration and in fiscal arrangements and to advise and control the bishop.[14]

With the responsibility of maintaining the peace, he had the power to set up the machinery necessary for that purpose. He was naturally restricted in regard to foreign relations, which the king guarded jealously, but it is interesting to note that the Bishops of Durham used this power to a surprising extent.

Just how much of a burden the bishop was expected to bear in keeping down the Scot raids had not been stated, but in 1298, Bishop Bek, who was of the belligerent type, settled the question for his time by undertaking a whole campaign on behalf of the king. In several other campaigns he sent a large number of troops for whom the king could petition but could not demand; in each case the wording of the petition indicated that fact. When, in 1322, the king made a demand for support for a Scot campaign, the bishop promised aid if the king would guarantee that the action would not be looked upon as a precedent.[15] In the early sixteenth century the king gained control over military affairs in Durham, only to lose it again very shortly, and it was not until the seventeenth century that it passed clearly to the king.

In the matter of the admiralty, the bishop's power is seen from the fact that when the act settling the jurisdiction of the royal court of admiralty was drafted in 1661, an express proviso was inserted that nothing in the act should be construed to the prejudice of the "ancient jurisdiction and privileges of the Bishops of Durham in the admiralty within the County Palatine of Durham and Sadberg"; secondly, the presence of the right is seen also in the fact that when an attempt was made in the seventeenth century to bring the bishopric under the jurisdiction of the high court of admiralty, enough opposition resulted to defeat the attempt. It should be stated, however, that the bishop's right was always subordinated to the king because of the obvious connection between the exercise of this right and the control of foreign affairs.

[14] Lapsley, *op. cit.*, discusses these powers at length.

[15] Hutchinson, *op. cit.*, 239; William Fordyce, *The history and antiquity of the county palatine of Durham*, I, 47-48; *Cal. of close rolls, 1307-1313*, 568; Kellaw, *Register*, III, 45, 555.

Because admiralty records do not appear until 1534, it is difficult to say what advantage the bishops took of their right in this matter. We do find that many cases were tried in the bishop's court that would ordinarily have been tried in the admiralty courts of the king.[16]

The bishops had the right to all lands forfeited within the province for treason or other major causes. The right was specifically recognized by parliament in 1330, when Bishop Kellaw made the demand. When Edward III wished to usurp it, he had parliament withdraw all such privileges, admitting at the same time that according to the common law the bishop possessed the right. Of course, the bishops could do nothing about the parliamentary act except to ignore it, and this they did by taking over a number of forfeitures in the next century.[21] Parliament again acted in 1534, but it was not until 1571 that the question was definitely settled by taking the right away from the bishops.[17]

The bishops had the right to their own money and their own mint and could grant charters to cities. They maintained at Durham an exchequer organization on much the same plan as that at Westminster. Their revenue was derived from taxation, from their position as feudal lords, and as heads of the state. A mint existed at Durham from 1066 until the time of Henry VIII, but only a few of the bishops made use of it.[18]

All the rights mentioned above were vested in the bishop by virtue of his civil authority. But he had another set of powers in virtue of his status as universal landlord. The list is a long one, but the chief rights so held were those of primer seisin in reliefs; wardships of lands held by incompetents; control of all mines; the right to royal fish, whales and sturgeon cast ashore or taken near the coast; the right to wreck; to treasure trove; to waif or stolen goods abandoned; to estray or unclaimed beasts or cattle; to deodand; the right to forests; the erection of fairs and markets; to returns from mines of iron, lead and coal, which were very

[16] *Victoria county history of Durham*, II, 148 ff.; Kellaw, *Register*, IV, 201; Hutchinson, *op. cit.*, 254.

[17] Lapsley, *op. cit.*, 127 ff.

[18] *Victoria county history of Durham*, II, 152; Lapsley, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

numerous in the palatinate and which were worked extensively, especially in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.[19]

A third group of rights enjoyed by the bishop grew out of his power over the judiciary. By 1217, Durham had become practically a royal court. It had the same procedure and was the only court to which the people of Durham had access. Under the law the bishop was treated just as a king. No action could be brought against him in his own courts; those seeking redress against him had to petition the bishop and his council. In 1243, the Abbot of St. Mary's, York, resorted to the royal court at Westminster in an action involving the holding of land; Westminster refused to hear the plea, holding that the matter belonged to Durham. At this time the theory of the law allowed to the palatine courts exclusive jurisdiction over land in the palatinate. The courts of Durham did not give the king's justice and did not punish breaches of the king's peace, but awarded the bishop's justice and the bishop's peace.[20]

Like the king, too, the bishop had the power of pardoning. Even those pardoned by the king usually sought a like pardon from the bishop in the palatinate. He had the power to suspend the application of the law in many cases and could grant relief from serving on juries or assizes or attending sessions of the county courts; it was only in 1536 that the judiciary supremacy of the palatinate was transferred by act of parliament from the bishop to the king.

Invested, then, with these powers, which were for all practical purposes royal, the Bishops of Durham wished to have the rights of kings in the palatinate, and during most of the time between 1066 and 1485, they approached quite closely to their ideal. It is true that the king on many occasions infringed more or less on the privileges and prerogatives of the bishops, but until the time of Elizabeth, the latter were usually successful in vindicating their rights.

Edward I probably tried more often than the other kings to wrest Durham from the power of the bishop, but he was not suc-

[19] *Victoria county history of Durham*, II, 152-155.

[20] Bassett discusses this question; see note 12.

cessful. Perhaps his failure is to be explained by the fact that the incumbent was so able and so dexterous, for it was Edward's bad fortune that Anthony Bek was bishop at the time. Graystanes, a resident of the palatinate, reported that Bek was a "most magnificent prelate, living in a degree of splendor inferior to none but his sovereign, and only exceeded by the king in his military actions, skill and power; and was more assiduous about affairs of government than in the execution of his episcopal functions." [21]

Surtees writes:

> The Palatine power reached its highest elevation in the splendid pontificate of Anthony Beke. Surrounded by his Officers of State, or marching at the head of his troops, in peace or in war, he appeared as the military chief of a powerful and independent Franchise. The Court of Durham exhibited all the appendages of Royalty; nobles addressed the Palatine Sovereign kneeling, and, instead of menial servants, knights waited in his presence-chamber, and at his table, bareheaded and standing. Impatient of controul, whilst he asserted an oppressive superiority over the Convent, and trampled on the rights of his vassals, he jealously guarded his own Palatine Franchise, and resisted the encroachments of the Crown when they trenched on the privileges of the Aristocracy.[22]

Although Edward was exceedingly jealous of him, he was unable to subdue Bek. When the latter went to Rome without the king's permission, Edward immediately seized the government of Durham and changed all the officers. But on his return, the bishop appealed to parliament and got back his palatinate. Ignoring superiors, real and alleged, was all in the day's work for him. Summoned to Rome many times to answer to charges, he answered some, ignored others. That he was able to keep in good standing there, however, is seen from the fact that in 1306 he was made Patriarch of Jerusalem by the pope.[23]

Edward tried to dispossess him again in that same year; this time the people had complained against the bishop and the latter had shown contempt for the king. It would seem that the bishop was in a serious predicament; but the king died the next

[21] Hutchinson, *op. cit.*, 239.

[22] Surtees, *op. cit.*, I, cxxxiii. The name of the bishop is spelled in various ways.

[23] *Cal. of papal letters*, II, 10.

year and Bek so ingratiated himself with Edward II that the king not only restored his bishopric "for the honour of God of the glorious confessor St. Cuthbert and for the especial affection he had long entertained for the bishop," but, in addition, made him king of the Isle of Man.[24]

When Edward III in 1327 seized some possessions of Durham, Bishop Beaumont obtained restitution; he presented his petition to parliament, stating the ancient privileges of Durham and the royal charters of former sovereigns in confirmation of his rights. After a full hearing, the bishop's claims, supported by the investigation of records and precedents, were deemed to be established. Henry VIII was really the first to injure the palatinate seriously, which he did by curtailing the feudal privileges. It is true that the bishops later recovered their privileges, but the power of the palatinate was more of a shadow than a reality after 1547.[25]

It was not so easy to effect lasting royal infringements, for the bishops had built up from the first a civil organization that was both notable and powerful. Up to 1500, the position of Durham in the legal machinery of the kingdom may well be compared to the status of a dependent foreign country. When the king had business with the county, or any part of it, he was obliged to communicate with the bishop. In consequence of this extreme independence, the county was not represented in the House of Commons until 1675.[26]

While recording the rights, privileges and powers of the bishops of Durham, it may be pointed out, in view of what will later be said in regard to the colony of Maryland, that the lot of the people in the palatinate seems to have been favorable enough. After all, the powers that the bishop had were his largely because he was the protector of Durham against invasion, whether by the king or by the Scots, and whether that invasion was for land or for money. For during the late middle ages especially, the people of the kingdom were heavily taxed, largely for wars, both in men and in money. On the other hand, the lands of the bishop brought a

[24] Scharf, *op. cit.*, I, 60.
[25] *Letters and papers of Henry VIII*, v. 12 (2), 186 (38).
[26] Bassett, *op. cit.*, 23.

revenue sufficiently large to enable him to live on his own, and it was rarely that the people complained against the bishop's tax.

Moreover, an assembly existed where they could, and often did, air their grievances or present their petitions. It is true that they had occasion to do both, but the bishops usually anticipated such moves. All in all, the people were ordinarily satisfied with their government, and when they were threatened with its loss, resisted strenuously.

The story of the rise of the assembly is traced with difficulty, largely for the reason that the assembly and the council had little or no independent history in the early years. A piece of evidence that goes back almost to the Conquest indicates that both institutions existed and, at certain times at least, acted independently.[27] A dispute had arisen between two advisers of Bishop Walcher in 1080; the bishop had the matter threshed out in his council, but it was brought up again in the assembly, where several of the members became enraged at the stand taken by the bishop and they murdered him. Indeed, the convening of the assembly was looked upon as a custom even before the Conquest, according to the evidence of a Durham Gospel Book:

> Haec est consuetudo et lex sancti Patris Cuthberti a religiosis et potentibus viris antiquitus instituta; scilicet ut ante ipsius Festum, quod mense Septembris celenniter celebratur, omnes Barones, scilicet Teines et Dreinges, aliique probi homines, sub Sancto praedicto terram tenentes, Dunelmum conveniant . . . ibidem renovent et confirment legem et consuetudinem Pacis S. Cuthberti, viz., qualiter pax Festi ipsius ab omnibus sit observanda et tenenda.[28]

The form of invitation to attend the feast of St. Cuthbert is to be found in the letter-book of Bishop Richard de Bury (1333-1345). The assembly was made up of the ordinary freeholders plus the bishop's council; it sat often as a court of law as well as a legislative assembly.

However, it is not to our purpose here to trace the history of the growth of the assembly; it is rather a case of discovering, at

[27] *Victoria county history of Durham*, II, 146; Lapsley also discusses the question at length.

[28] *Chronicle of Florence of Worcester*, 180 ff. (Bohn's antiquarian library edition).

any time during the history of the palatinate, the existence of an assembly and the status of the relationship between it and the count palatine. When a particularly fierce Scottish raid occurred in 1315, an assembly decided to raise a sum of money to buy off the invaders; this sum was to be raised by taxation. We have here a case of the assembly levying a tax, for the action was taken during the absence of the bishop.[29] A similar sum was raised through a like process in 1334 for the purpose of paying a debt; this was done during a vacancy in the See. These cases are cited to show that an assembly existed and had the power to tax itself on its own initiative and for its own ends; a few other like instances might be added. But it is to be noted in all cases that when the right was exercised, the bishop was absent or the See was vacant. In his presence, the assembly was called by him alone, and it did not tax except at his direction; he was always able to prevent any efforts at taxation by the fact that his income was always great enough for his wants. However, the assembly had another real function in the fact that without its consent, no impost levied by the bishop could be collected.[30]

Nor did the assembly go far in the matter of legislation. "For all practical purposes," Lapsley tells us, "the palatine assembly had no legislative functions."[31] The fact that the ordinary laws of England applied to the palatinate obviated the necessity of legislation in that political structure. The machinery for legislative functions was present without being used except in a rudimentary way; in need of any special or local regulations, action was usually taken by the bishop's council. Most of the freemen attended the assembly, and not only could, but frequently did speak out, for their liberty and their purse were usually at stake. And once the assembly found its power to independent action, the bishop became more circumspect. There were exceptions. Under Anthony Bek, for instance, several pointed disputes arose between the bishop and his subjects. But the subjects were no more successful in dealing with this famous character than the king had been. He signed a charter which incorporated several

[29] Lapsley, *op. cit.*, 125. [30] Bassett, *op. cit.*, 25. [31] Lapsley, *op. cit.*, 127.

demands of his subjects in 1303, but it was delivered to the people only by royal command.

When Charles, then, incorporated in the Charter of Maryland the powers of the bishop of Durham, and such powers as the bishop held at any time, he granted him powers that were only somewhat short of royal.

Mereness writes:

> The lord proprietor of Maryland was, therefore, made the grantee of the territory with almost unrestricted privileges as to the use he might make of it; he was made the fountain of all office, title, and honor; he was placed at the head of the Church; he was made the center and immediate source of all military, executive and judicial authority; and there was some ground for his claiming the right to be the originator and controller of all legislative authority.[32]

These powers were very extensive, far more so than like powers in European palatinates; for the proprietor was not bound, as were the counts palatine in Europe, by peculiar laws or ancient customs. After 1715, the governor, appointed by the proprietor, had to be ratified by the crown, and he was, consequently, more or less under the influence of the latter. But up to that time, due very much to the large measure of power granted him by Charles, the proprietor was in a position to assert a wide independence.

FRANCIS A. MULLIN.

[32] Newton D. Mereness, *Maryland as a proprietary province*, 8.

MISCELLANY

TWO EARLY MEDIEVAL HERETICS: AN EPISODE IN THE LIFE OF ST. BONIFACE

The conversion of the European races is a topic of absorbing interest to every student of Church history. Yet how meagre are the details of missionary enterprise that have come down to us from the early Middle Ages. Only by piecing together widely scattered casual notices, by reading between the lines of cut and dried legal documents, by ingenious combinations and inferences can we obtain even an inadequate idea of the evangelization of the nations of Europe. There are, however, two exceptions to this general rule. Thanks to Bede's incomparable Ecclesiastical History and to the Correspondence of St. Boniface we possess more ample and satisfactory information in regard to the conversion of England and the work of the Anglo-Saxon missionaries on the Continent. Every student of Church history is acquainted with Bede's History; the same cannot be said of the Letters of St. Boniface, perhaps because they are less accessible, both in the original and in translations, to the general reader.[1] These letters, with those addressed to him or to his friends which have been preserved with his own, cover the period from 716 to the time of his death (754). Some are to the popes, concerning matters of doctrine and discipline; one is a message of admonition to Aethelbald, the profligate King of Mercia, others are to the rulers of the Franks; the majority are written to the Saint's friends in England and on the Continent. All these letters are of great historical interest and value, and it would be worth while indeed to present them, entire or in part, to the English reader. But this task must be left to some future biographer of the great apostle. In the following pages we shall give some extracts from those of the letters which are concerned with the Saint's long conflict with two obstinate heretics and schismatics, the Irishman Clement and the Frank Aldebert.

After his third and last journey to Rome in 737, St. Boniface devoted the next ten years almost exclusively to organization and reform work in the far-flung nation of the Franks. The reform, as far as ecclesiastical legislation was concerned, was completed in 744 by the Council of Soissons. Many years, however, were to elapse before the laws enacted could be fully carried out. If the reform was to be effective it had to be extended to the whole clerical body, and through the clergy to the people. This was a giant task, for the condition of the greater part of the secular

[1] The latest and best edition: *S. Bonifatii et Lulli Epistolae*, ed. M. Tangl, Berlin, 1916.

clergy was lamentable in the extreme.[2] The study of the Scriptures and the Fathers was held by many to be quite useless. Hardly anywhere was the Gospel preached to the people. Payment was demanded for the administration of baptism. The baptismal words were mutilated, the abjurations omitted, the ceremonies abbreviated at will. An Irish priest, Sampson by name, denied the necessity of baptism for salvation; the imposition of the hands of the bishop sufficed, according to him, to change a pagan into a Catholic Christian.

It was not always easy to remove unworthy priests. Sometimes the faithful sided with them against the bishop; sometimes they found countenance and protection at Court. Bishops like Milo of Trier and Gewilip of Mainz made no effort to purify the ranks of their clergy, and resisted every attempt of Boniface to do so. Deposed priests often refused to be sent to a monastery to do penance; they wished to live as laymen and demanded a portion of the Church revenues for their sustenance. Others pretended to have been absolved from their sins by the pope and insisted on being reinstated; still others, in defiance of the bishops, sought and obtained appointments to the churches or chapels erected by the nobles on their estates.[3]

The scarcity of good pastors made it practically impossible in some cases to cast out the hirelings. Boniface reports an instance of this kind to Archbishop Egbert of York. A priest who had sinned grievously had been restored to his office after the expiration of his time of penance. According to the letter of the law Boniface should have deposed him; but as he was the only priest in a very large missionary district, he had permitted him to continue his ministry. The fear of scandalizing the people was another consideration which sometimes prevented Boniface from applying the full rigor of the law. Thus he did not exact the resignation of a priest who had sinned and done penance, because neither his transgression nor his penance were known to his parishioners, who held him in on their estates.[4]

False and pernicious teachings, too, had made headway among the clergy and the people, and had to be exterminated. Two heretics especially, Aldebert and Clement, the former in Neustria, the latter in Austrasia, caused Boniface no end of trouble. His conflict with them lasted for several years, and it was only with the aid of the highest authority in Christendom that he succeeded in overcoming them at last.[5]

---

[2] Cf. Ep. 80, 87, 63, 60, 51, 50, and the so-called Würzburg Collection of Ecclesiastical Statutes.

[3] On the *Ecclesiae Propriae*, see Saegmüller, *Kirchenrecht*, I[3], 276 ff.

[4] Ep. 91.

[5] Cf. Ep. 57, 59, 60, 62, 77; Willibald, *Vita Bonifatii*, 7; *Vita Quarta Bonifatii*, 2; Otloh, *Vita Bonifatii*, 40.

Aldebert, a Frank of humble birth, was a remarkable man in many ways. There was the making of a zealous and successful missionary in him, but being early led astray by false teachers, he became instead a religious fanatic and impostor of the most dangerous sort. He composed an autobiography, only a fragment of which has survived; still it suffices to characterize him. He styles himself "the holy and blessed servant of God, the renowned and glorious bishop Aldebert, the elect of God." Before the hour of his "blessed birth" it was revealed to his mother in a dream that he should be endowed with extraordinary grace. Hence he claimed to be something more than a mere man, a kind of mediator between God and men. From the utmost ends of the earth, he said, an angel of the Lord in human form had brought him relics of wonderful sacredness, through which he could obtain from God whatsoever he pleased. He also boasted of possessing a letter written by our Lord Himself. It had fallen to the earth in Jerusalem, where it was found by the Archangel Michael. "A priest named Icore made a copy of it and then sent it to Geremia to another priest called Talasius; Talasius sent it to the priest Leoban in Arabia; Leoban sent it to the town of Betfania; here the priest Macrius got possession of it and sent it to the mountain of the holy Archangel Michael. By the hand of the angel of the Lord it was carried to the city of Rome to the tomb of St. Peter, where the keys of the kingdom of heaven are kept." How the far-travelled epistle came to Aldebert, we are not told, nor have we any clue to its contents.[6]

Aldebert began to preach in Neustria about the year 741. His rude eloquence, his pretended sanctity and miracles, and above all his catering to the superstitious instincts of his hearers, made him popular from the very outset. He led about a number of persons whom he had hired for money to feign themselves maimed, deaf or blind, in order that by blasphemously invoking the Blessed Trinity he might appear to restore them to health. A prayer which he made use of on these occasions is still in part preserved. It begins as follows:

> Lord, God almighty, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, Alpha and Omega, who sittest on the seventh throne above the Cherubim and Seraphim, great mercy and sweetness is in Thee. Father of the holy Angel, who didst make heaven and earth and the sea and all that is in them, Thee I invoke, to Thee I cry, Thee I invite to come to me, a poor wretch, because Thou didst condescend to say: 'Whatsoever you shall ask the Father in My Name, I have given to you.' Thee I seek, Thee I call, to Christ the Lord I commend my soul. . . .

He then summons a troop of angels to his aid, to whom he gives the most

[6] On the so-called "Letters from Heaven," see E. Bernheim, *Mittelalterliche Zeitanschauungen*, I, 129.

outlandish names, no doubt to fire the imagination of his hearers and to make them believe that he is in direct communication with the heavenly powers: "I beg and conjure you, angel Uriel, angel Reguel, angel Tubuel, angel Michael, angel Adinus, angel Tubuas, angel Saboct, angel Simiel."

Aldebert even succeeded in deluding several bishops, who in the face of the Church Canons conferred episcopal consecration upon him. Henceforth his pride and presumption knew no bounds. He put himself on a level with the Apostles of Christ; nay, he regarded himself more than they. He refused to consecrate churches in their honor, and when anyone wished to make a pilgrimage to Rome, he would ask him, what was the use of visiting the threshhold of the Apostles, implying that there was a greater than Peter or Paul present before him. When people came to him to confess their sins, he would tell them: "I know all your sins; the secrets of your hearts are revealed to me; there is no need of confessing them; go to your homes absolved and in peace." On hills and by fountains he erected crosses, and in the fields and meadows little chapels dedicated in his own honor, and told the people to offer up their prayers there.

The impression which the impostor made wherever he appeared was extraordinary. Multitudes of simple country folk, women especially, followed him about. They venerated him as their "holy apostle and patron, who wrought many signs and wonders." They divided his hair and the parings of his nails among them as holy relics, and when they hurried to his crosses and chapels, they mingled prayers to their prophet with their prayers to Christ; "the merits of St. Aldebert," they said, "will help us in our needs."

The fact that so many poor people were led astray by a charlatan like Aldebert is a proof that they were neglected by their own priests and bishops. They reposed greater confidence in the fanatic who spoke to them of God, however unintelligibly, than in the men who called themselves their pastors and bishops but lived the lives of warriors and courtiers.

Of Clement, Boniface's other antagonist, we know even less than of Aldebert. He was one of the many Celts who labored in Germany as missionary bishops without fixed Sees. He probably clung as tenaciously as most of his countrymen to certain peculiarities of his native Church. It was not on this account, however, that he came into collision with Boniface, but because he openly opposed points of doctrine and discipline held in common by the whole Western Church. Romans and Franks, Celts and Saxons were convinced of the necessity of clerical celibacy. Clement took to himself a wife, and declared that this did not prevent him from being a Catholic bishop. In the eyes of Celts and Romans alike the authority of the Fathers of the Church was paramount in matters of Scriptural interpretation; Clement refused to recognize any authority

other than his own reason. The Church strictly forbade marriage with a deceased brother's widow; Clement maintained that, as such marriages were commended in the Old Law, they were permitted to every Christian. All Christians believed that by His descent into Hell Christ liberated only the souls of the just, but that the godless were reserved unto the Judgment Day; Clement asserted that all the departed without exception, the believers as well as the unbelievers, the servants of God as well as the worshippers of idols, were delivered on this occasion. Clement was also heterodox on the question of predestination, but what the exact nature of his error was, we are not told.

We hear of Aldebert and Clement for the first time in 743. In the summer of this year Boniface informed Pope Zachary that he had condemned them as "false prophets, servants of Satan and precursors of Antichrist," and sentenced them to confinement in a monastery. The Council of Soissons (744) excommunicated Aldebert anew, and Pippin ordered the crosses set up by him to be removed and burned. These drastic measures did not, however, have the desired effect. The misguided people clung to their prophet all the more passionately now that he had become a martyr also. They accused Boniface of robbing them of their "apostle, intercessor and wonder-worker." As for Clement, he became really popular only after his imprisonment. After a short period of confinement both Aldebert and Clement were liberated, probably by their infuriated followers, and continued to preach and teach as before. Neither Pippin nor Karlmann took steps to punish this flagrant act of insubordination. On Boniface's remonstrance they consented, however, that the heretics should be summoned to appear before a general Frankish synod.

The synod met in the spring of 745, but neither the exact date nor the place of meeting is known. For our very imperfect knowledge of the proceedings we are indebted to the pope's reply to Boniface's report. Aldebert and Clement were once more solemnly condemned, degraded and sent to a monastery to do penance. Again they managed to escape and took up their wonted manner of life. As the secular power did nothing to silence them, Boniface sought the aid of the pope. He sent a messenger to Rome with a full statement of the pernicious errors and practices of the heretics, and asked a former Roman acquaintance, the Cardinal-Deacon Gemmulus, to take the matter in hand. Boniface probably merely desired a formal papal confirmation of the sentence passed by the Frankish synod. But Zachary did more: a council convoked by him in the Lateran (Oct. 25-27, 745) anathematized Clement and condemned Aldebert to be degraded from all his functions and to do penance for his errors; if he persisted in his wickedness, he too was to be excommunicated. The acts

of the council were sent to Boniface with the injunction to publish them throughout the Frank dominions.

Still Aldebert and Clement would not submit. Their popularity indeed received a severe blow through the energetic action of the pope and his legate, but what they lost among the common people, they gained in other quarters. Boniface's enemies among the clergy—and their number and influence were by no means insignificant—were their friends. A certain bishop Godalsacius openly joined them. It was even rumored that they had gained favor at Court. However that may be, it is certain that neither Karlmann nor his brother thought themselves bound to carry out the decree of the Roman synod. A year after their condemnation the heretics were still at large. Zachary advised Boniface to have them examined anew by a synod, and if they still protested their innocence to send them to Rome, where they would be dealt with according to their deserts.

After this we hear no more of Aldebert and Clement. The story told long afterwards of a public discussion between Boniface and Aldebert, of the latter's defeat and imprisonment, renewed escape and subsequent murder by some savage swineherds, must be rejected as an improbable fiction; but it is a fiction that would not have been imagined unless in the life of a man who had made a deep and lasting impression on the minds of his contemporaries.

JOHN LAUX.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Challenge of Humanism. By LOUIS J. A. MERCIER. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1933. Pp. vi, 283. $3.00.)

This is essentially a learned brief for that branch of Humanism represented by the author's late friend Irving Babbitt, also with sympathetic appreciation for Seilliere and More, but particularly with reference to their compatibility with Catholic philosophy and theology, and with their guarantee that his exposition of their doctrine is correct. Only actual reading can appreciate the philosophic, theologic, and aesthetic depths plumbed, yet a brief review may cast a few beams of warning across them as well.

First of all, he defines Humanism to his own taste, as the great secular opponent of Naturalism (the evil) down the ages (hence co-operator with Neo-Scholastic philosophy and the Church), whereas Webster (1935) and the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* agree in opposing it to the supernatural as well as merely natural. Thus of the fifteenth-century Renaissance Humanism we are told: "At first a violent assertion of individualism and neo-paganism, it found its equilibrium and issued into what may be called the era of humanistic civilzation which lasted into the eighteenth century" (pp. 2-3) and was followed by Naturalism, from which the revived Humanism of today is to rescue us. He limits Humanism to writers he considers representative of it, and on such basis takes up its critics, like Msgr. Sheen (omitting such a notable recent critic as Hyde, *Prospects of Humanism,* 1931). There is only passing mention of such Humanists as Potter, Elliott, Eliot, Dewey, Reese, and none at all of such as the scientific humanist Cassius Keyser (*Humanism and Science,* 1930) and the proletarian Leon Samson (*The New Humanism,* 1930).

Mercier argues that Babbitt's "higher will," "inner check," or "*frein vital,*" established by observation of the data of consciousness and history, "corresponds to grace in the Christian system" (p. 175), salvation through which is open to all men of good will. Seilliere, Mercier feels, differs from Babbitt, in depending rather on reason than the "higher will" to check the "imperialist impulse" (p. 104), — represents only "sub-humanistic" Stoicism (p. 105). Paul More is more interested in the dualism of good and evil than in the "inner check" on naturalism, thus getting into the "very thick of religious controversies" (p. 254), unlike Babbitt who pauses at the threshold because he feels

that it is impossible to recognize the action of the supernatural in man without pressing beyond to the problem of the actuality or the transmission

of a Revelation . . . (so) . . . he keeps free from the entanglements of religious controversy (pp. 255-6).

Mercier admonishes More (p. 247) for his resulting plunge into merely individualistic religion, — though following up his conviction of the supernatural, still remaining aloof from infallible authority by venturing only to Anglicanism. But is there greater merit in Babbitt's "keeping his skirts clean" altogether, while presiding from the height of a straddle that enables him to collect praise and encouragement from all parties (to merely so continue)? Why admit only to excuse, Babbitt's failure to provide ultimate ends and values, the driving force of ethics (pp. 190-5)? But Mercier does feel the need of a

> . . . broader term than that of humanism to include, and yet leave us free to keep clear, both methods of approach [the supernatural and natural] to this integral state of man. The term Human Integralism would seem called for (p. 169).

Many theologians will of course wait with interest for Msgr. Sheen's response to Mercier's reply (pp. 179-185) to his indictment of Humanism on points of doctrine. But there are other considerations. Instead of Scholasticism reinforcing Humanism (pp. 155-6 and elsewhere), is it not rather a case of Humanism being a halting, partial, independent, secular reinforcement of Scholasticism? The best of the Humanists appear to be an earnest group slowly thinking their way to the Truth through the hard route of independent but sincere and honest intellectual searchings—a route not without its pitfalls and detours as compared to the quicker, surer road of submission to the True Guide—which however requires irrevocable burning of one's bridges behind one's self. The convert makes this sacrifice. The Humanist cautiously cruises about the threshold. May not featuring this pause and independent buffer-state position encourage its continuance?

MAJOR L. J. YOUNCE.

Marquette University.

Makers of Christianity from Jesus to Charlemagne. By SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1934. Pp. xii, 256. $2.00.)

The selection for these biographical sketches is carefully made. With the exception of Basilides, Marcion and other Gnostics, Constantine and Charlemagne, they are mainly Fathers of the Church: Ignatius, Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Lactantius, Athanasius, Basil and Ambrose, John Chrysostom, Jerome and Augustine, Leo the Great, Gregory the Great and Gregory of Tours. To

these are added the founder of Western Monachism, Benedict of Nursia, and Boniface, the great missionary of Germany. To introduce the student into the history of the Church through its living representatives of speculative thought and its active leaders is as pleasant as it is instructive, when the facts are marshalled around a few salient men as is done in the present work.

As we might expect from the compiler of *A Bibliographical Guide to the History of Christianity,* a carefully selected and briefly evaluated bibliography of recent works for each Life is appended in which Catholic authors find their place side by side with non-Catholic writers. There is one exception to this practice, and it is more significant in its scope than might appear on the surface. The chapters dealing with the beginnings of Christianity, with Christ, St. Peter and St. Paul and the Evangelists have no references to Catholic scholars, although of late such works have multiplied and are not inferior in critical acumen and sound scholarship to the best on the other side.

It is impossible that two tendencies, so opposed to each other as are Catholicism and Liberal Protestantism, should interpret history in the same light or choose from among a multitude of facts the same facts for special notice. As far as it goes, this work is a fairminded presentation of the growth of Christian life and Christian institutions. The spirit in which it is written is objective in the main. Still a subtle atmosphere which pervades its pages makes us realize that the supernatural element in Christianity is tacitly denied. This is painfully evident in the eleven pages consecrated to the life of Jesus: Jesus "abandoned his workshop in Nazareth, even mother and brothers and sisters being left henceforth to shift for themselves." He had no intention of forming a new religion: He "would gladly have become, like the prophets of old, a new creative force in the remaking of Hebrew religion. But this was not to be the ultimate outcome of his labors." After His crucifixion "the disciples quickly disbanded, and being Galileans returned temporarily disillusioned to the scenes of their former life." The vision of the risen Saviour is mentioned in such a way as to give the impression that the vision was a vision indeed, but no reality. Still less satisfactory is his brief mention of baptism and the breaking of bread.

This spirit is less evident in the rest of the book, though again and again the Catholic reader becomes aware that facts are presented in a light which he cannot accept. Take as an instance the difficulties of Arius with his bishop Alexander: "As is the custom with bishops, Alexander had the ecclesiastical rather than the logical mind, and went to the extreme of affirming that the Father and the Son were coeternal." The author has no conception of Catholic tradition and fails to see its importance. It is not true to say that the 28 canon of the Council of Chalcedon "gave to

the most holy Church of Constantinople or New Rome *an equality* with old Rome" (p. 192). This statement is somewhat modified on page 196.

A. BELLWALD, S. M.

Marist Seminary, Washington, D. C.

Conversion. The Old and New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo. By A. D. NOCK. (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1933. Pp. 309. $5.00.)

This book is mainly concerned with the evaluation of the appeals made by the various pagan cults and mystery religions in the period from Alexander to the triumph of Christianity and with the significance of these cults and religions in the lives and outlooks of their adherents. Judaism and Christianity are dealt with, but more briefly, and are regarded from the outside: that is, the author tries to present Christianity especially as it would become known in a general way to pagans, to examine its appeal to the latter from this point of view, and to determine the changes in thinking and conduct its acceptance involved. The author is at home in his subject and has made on the whole a useful contribution to the literature, in English at least, on the history of ancient religion. The substance of his book was given in lectures at Dublin in 1931 and at Boston in 1933. This explains the familiar and pleasant style of the exposition, but at the same time is the cause of a certain sketchiness and vagueness in the latter, which is not altogether removed by the series of notes on each chapter at the end of the volume.

The book as a whole, as I have said, is valuable, but it must be recommended with reservations. While Professor Nock is willing to admire that uniqueness of Christianity in many respects, his general point of view is nationalistic and hence he refuses to recognize the divinity of Christ and the supernatural character of His religion. Furthermore, he does not distinguish sharply enough between the mystery religions and Christianity, in spite of the essential differences, and he tends definitely to underestimate the fundamental significance of Christ's personality as a factor in the spread of the Christian faith. It is only occasionally, however, that the author's rationalism leads him to make such statements as these on p. 249, line 12 ff.: "The issue is after all the doctrine of grace. The genius of Christianity lies on the side of Augustine, the genius of paganism on the side of Pelagius, the one built on a consciousness of sin and on revelation, the other on a consciousness of goodness and on common sense."

The book is well printed and indexed. On page 35, line 7 for *Gagates,* read *Gadatas.* On page 250, lines 1 and 2, we read "such sympathetic understanding we know in the work of Mencius and of other early Jesuit

missionaries in China." Surely the printer's devil must be held responsible for enrolling Mencius among the followers of St. Ignatius.

MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE.

Catholic University of America.

Gibbon's Antagonism to Christianity. By SHELBY T. MCCLOY, B. A., B. Litt. (Oxon.), Instructor in History, Duke University. (Chapel Hill: the University of North Carolina Press. 1933. Pp. 400. $4.00.)

The purely expository aim of this account of the "Gibbon Controversy" from 1776 to our own day, is admirably carried out. According to the preface, discussion of the merits of the questions involved, and also treatment of Gibbon's sources, and his psychological and other determinants, are reserved for future studies. In this study all important angles in criticism of Gibbon seem to have been accounted for.

Nearly half of the work is occupied with the controversies during Gibbon's lifetime. The two chapters on the replies from the two universities illustrate the relative bitterness of the Oxford scholars in their attitude toward Gibbon, contrasted with the urbanity of the Cambridge critics. Porson's and Watson's discussions of Gibbon's antagonism to Christianity are given a determinative place in the whole history of the controversy, and are represented as having set the "friendly" tone of Protestant criticism of Gibbon, especially after 1850 (p. 259), and as even having had an influence on the earliest notable Catholic attack by the Abbate Nicola Spedalieri in 1784 (pp. 198, 199). The acuteness of the Abbate's observations on the leniency of the university critics toward Deism and their bias against Catholicism is recognized (p. 198). In the chapter on "Other Contemporary Assaults," the eccentric Unitarian, James Edward Hamilton, is credited with having in some measure anticipated in 1790 Hilaire Belloc's and Fr. James M. Gillis' exposure of Gibbon's scornful ignorance of theological issues, his negligence and inaccuracy in the account of the Conciliar period, and his minimization of the evidence for papal authority in the primitive and Conciliar periods (pp. 223-228, 227, 228, n. 3; cf. pp. 288-296). Curiously, Hamilton's aim was radically and sincerely destructive (note 1, p. 223). Yet he detected the furtive and ingrained obliquity of the "modern" historians of his day in their treatment of evidence; and his criticism of Mosheim, Lardner, Beausobre, and other guides followed by Gibbon must be reckoned, with S. R. Maitland's later discursions, as part of the reaction among British Protestants against the distorted historiographical tradition of the Magdeburg Centuriators. In Hamilton's case, the animus of the "moderns" seemed to him an unnecessary confession of weakness. Mr. McCloy regards Hamilton's attack as one of the most important in the whole controversy.

On the whole, the three chapters on the contemporary phase of the Gibbon controversy exhibit a different picture from that given wide currency, in which Gibbon, in his *Vindication* (1779) is represented as easily routing his "rash and feeble assailants." Gibbon is shown to have been too satisfied with a rather cheap victory over the Oxford don, H. E. Davis, whose youth and recklessness got him into a ridiculous position. Fortified with the praise of Dr. Robertson, Horace Walpole and other *beaux esprits* Gibbon affected to regard most later criticisms as "buzzing of the hornets," disregarding or honoring them with Parthian shafts. Gibbon was appreciative of the courtesy of his abler critics. Yet the material gathered by Mr. McCloy shows that pertinent criticisms, within the knowledge of Gibbon, were made to which he attempted no serious reply, *e. g.*, those of the Catholic, Francis Eyre, on whose anonymity Gibbon cast reflections, though it might have been evident that this was on account of the penal statutes (pp. 173-178). There was an acrimonious passage with the Unitarian, Joseph Priestley, to whose political as well as religious radicalism Gibbon later called invidious attention in a note to his history (pp. 180, 193). Though many of the attacks on Gibbon were carping, impertinent, sometimes absurd, it cannot be said that his contemporaries in general were unprepared to discern his most serious defects as a historian. Gibbon reluctantly confessed errors, but found rectification even more difficult (pp. 69, 70).

Observing that overtly hostile attacks on Gibbon by Protestant writers virtually ended before 1850, the author concludes that "Protestant scholarship, and even popular theology, has ceased to trouble itself with Gibbon's conclusions as to Christianity" (pp. 259, 368). Factors in this indifference referred to are (pp. 255, 256): Biblical criticism, decline of belief in miracles, studies of comparative religion, biological evolutionary theory. Catholic writers, on the contrary, he says, have shown increased concern with Gibbon, as a result of new contacts and cultural changes due to migrations and economic changes affecting Catholic populations. The Abbate Spedalieri's contemptuous estimate of Gibbon as a menace to Christianity in 1784 contrasts with the discussion of Bishop M. N. S. Guillon (Paris, 1841), "one of the ablest of the Gibbon polemics" (pp. 277-286). Guillon, with C. H. de Paravey, charges Gibbon with contributing materially to the falsifications of the Christian past which aided in bringing upon France the fanatical cruelties of the Revolution. John Henry Newman's respect for Gibbon as a historian only intensified the concern with which he observed in 1861 how far England depended on Gibbon in the field of ecclesiastical history. Dealing with Gibbon's "Five Causes" for the spread of Christianity in his *Grammar of Assent* (1870), Newman admitted that these explanations, given an adequate construction, might account for the event, but asserted that the combination of the "causes"

calls itself for an explanation; which is to be found in the central supernatural figure of Christ (pp. 272-275). Among earlier minor details in the controversy, an honorable place is given to Fr. John Milner's defense (1792) against Gibbon's confusion with the infamous George of Cappadocia, of the name of St. George, Patron of England. The challenges of Belloc (1916, 1921, 1924, *Dublin Review*) and of Father Gillis (1925) are summarized with apparently fair objectivity (pp. 288-198) except for the stricture on one of the former's articles: "In the second half of his article he becomes an outspoken advocate of Roman primacy" (p. 295). Is it in some way historiographical bad form to be an "outspoken advocate" of a tradition and a claim for which the writer adduces historical evidence?

Even within the limits of the purely expository aim of this book, more adequate statement of general conclusions might be expected than are found on pp. 366-368. The author seems to infer that the animus displayed in the earlier stages of the Gibbon controversy is something incomprehensible to our times: that it "is impossible to transport ourselves into the real atmosphere of those who condemned or praised the historian in bygone days" (p. 368). Yet in the immediately preceding pages, he has been showing how important Gibbon's attack has seemed to later "rationalists" such as Leslie Stephen and J. B. Bury, to propagandist writers and publishers such as Peter Eckler (1883 ff.), the rationalist and atheist presses of Great Britain and this country, Edward Clodd, Joseph McCabe, J. M. Robertson, M. P. (pp. 332-341, 351-366). By these, however they variously criticize Gibbon, his destructive influence on faith in the supernatural is enough to qualify him for a monumental place. The more scholarly may condemn Gibbon's methods as "defective, inadequate and obsolete." The more zealous or shrewd managed to sell cheap popular editions of Gibbon to the number of four million copies before 1929 (p. 341), through the agency of endowed associations professedly devoted to "Reason" and "Truth." In this connection, forgetting the encyclopedists, and the continuous attrition of freemason influence on popular religious conceptions, Mr. McCloy refers to the organization of freethinking propaganda as a merely recent tendency — "As individuals they [freethinkers] have engaged in battle with a powerful organization" (p. 340). A marked change, he adds, "in the situation is taking place, and sooner or later the Christian churches will become conscious of it." The "churches," as a matter of fact, have been exposed to the pressure of anti-Christian organization and literature for about two centuries at least; and if Mr. McCloy's generalization about Protestant indifference to Gibbon's attack on Christianity is valid, it means that a large proportion of Christians have become accustomed to the pressure of anti-Christian argument, whether "antiquated" or not. Here the growing concern of Catholic

writers about Gibbon is significant, inasmuch as the publication of the more "obsolete" attacks on Christianity are circulated within reach of many Catholics, while many Protestants begin to feel that even Shaw and Wells are "dated," and look to later and starker nihilisms.

Hence it seems misleading to infer, as Mr. McCloy seems to infer in his concluding pages, that the permanent interest of Gibbon's attack on Christianity is mainly literary and psychological, that it merely concerns a memorable work of great genius and energy, the spirit and aim of which has now become almost incomprehensible. Mr. McCloy's own material indicates something quite different: that the subtler techniques of anti-Christianity have changed, while the older tactics are still found useful; that in intellectual circles a myopic fashion of regarding the Church as an insignificant factor in history is preferred; and that with plainer and harder-working folk it is still possible to exploit the opposite contention, that the Faith has been the ruin of civilizations and the defeat of genial human wishes.

W. T. M. GAMBLE.

Washington, D. C.

Alexandre Farnèse, Prince de Parme, Gouverneur Général des Pays-Bas (1545-1592). Three vols. By LÉON VAN DER ESSEN. (Brussels: Libraire Nationale d'Art et d'Histoire. 1933-1934. Pp. xxxix, 313, 366, 262.)

This impressive study, fruit of the distinguished learning of M. van der Essen of the University of Louvain, is of most timely interest. The new history, in a sense quite distinct from that intended by the American professor, is arriving. Events in the life of Europe since the disunion of Christendom are being written more and more from original sources and the truly tragic character of the significant periods is seen in proper setting and perspective. There are few who will not acknowledge that one of the key-points is to be found in the Low Countries during the Spanish rule. The virulence of the attack and misrepresentation of the nature of the events there during the reigns of Charles V and particularly of Philip II is a striking proof of the importance of the period. Colorless indeed are the acts of men passed over in silence by their enemies, but colorless was not the history of the Low Countries. This history ramifies into that of Italy, France, Spain and the German lands and at critical moments has determined the history of all in surprising ways. It was on this European frontier of Spain that Catholic culture confronted in heroic effort the enemies of her household, *superbia, cupiditas* and *dominio*. Spain eventually withdrew though not in complete defeat, for out of the conflict was to be preserved the islet of Belgium. Who in this strange

story was entirely free from these vices, and who did not have some touch of their strong contrary virtues? Who is the villain, and who is the hero? Was it Francis I, or Elizabeth of England, or Alba? Was it Charles V or Philip, or William the Silent? Was it Calvinism or the Catholic religion? All these played their part, no doubt, but as M. Pirenne points out in his preface, Alexander Farnese played an essential part: "Il est de ceux dont la personalité a si fortement influencé l'histoire de leur époque que le mieux connaître, c'est la mieux comprendre." This is just the accomplishment of M. van der Essen. In describing his hero, he has given us the elements by which we may understand the period.

Though Farnese has not gone unrecognized by historians, studies on him have been few and inadequate until the publication of Pietro Fea's *Allessandro Farnese* aroused a deeper interest. Since then important collections of documents of the sixteenth century and the correspondence with Margaret of Parma have become available and have rendered the task of presenting a balanced picture of the brilliant soldier-statesman at once easier and more difficult. The labor of sifting the mass of evidence in the documents of the Farnese family at Naples and Parma, and in the archives of Belgium, Spain, Venice, and the Vatican was tremendous and we are not surprised that M. van der Essen has devoted twenty years to the task. We may now enjoy his careful, scholarly generosity. It is not easy to draw the clear picture of such a fascinating, one might say romantic, character as that of Alexander Farnese in whom a mixed Spanish, Italian and Flemish ancestry was to mingle a rich inheritance of the practical and the ideal. A clear picture the mind must have in order to understand, whether it is achieved by loving detail or the high lights of intuitive flashes. Much of modern biography aims at the latter and usually misses. A biographer should be sympathetic but detached, seeing the inner man but not forgetting the age, entering into his ambitions but not omitting to weigh them in the scale of justice. M. van der Essen is mindful of these canons and in his sober and calm narrative introduces us to the Prince of Parma and leaves us with an affectionate appreciation of Alexander Farnese, the flower of his family.

Volume I deals with the formative years from 1545 to 1578. The background of the family influences is discussed and the relation of the Farnese ambitions in Italy with the Spanish interests in the Milanese area is indicated to explain the education of the young Farnese at the Court of Spain. At fourteen Farnese was already distinguished, very attractive with his dark head, somewhat haughty countenance, lively and penetrating glance and kindly ways. With his unhappy cousin, Don Carlos, heir to the throne, he was to share a taste for military literature; but in his uncle Don Juan, the future hero of Lepanto, he was to find his sister soul. The latter's energy, ambition and youthful zest matched his own, though he

knew that in important respects his own talents surpassed those of his uncle. The friendship thus begun matured in the campaigns against the Turk, reached its perfection in the difficult days in Flanders, and closed only with the death of the lonely and broken Don Juan in 1578. Various official marriages were discussed for him, finally to be set aside for a union with the Princess Maria of Portugal, who was a penitent of St. Ignatius of Loyola. The marriage was solemnized in Flanders where his mother, Margaret of Parma, was then Regent. This occasion gave him the first opportunity to observe the people among whom his destiny was to be resolved. The opinions he then formed were not to be changed upon more complete acquaintance, a tribute to his intelligence and judgment. He objected to the King's policy of dividing the command, giving the military into the charge of the Duke of Alba and the regency to Margaret, a favorite policy of Philip since by it he hoped the military elements of the situation could be less emphasized. In this Farnese had the more realistic grasp of the problem. He wished to serve Philip in Flanders but there was no opportunity then and for some years he had to wear out his energy at Parma until the campaigns against the Turks. At Lepanto his tact, skill, learning, and daring won him his first fame and the same qualities were to distinguish his first services in the Low Countries where Don Juan summoned him in 1577. The value of these services was thoroughly appreciated by Don Juan and when dying he named him his successor.

Volume II deals with the four crowded years of his authority, 1578-82, during which he continued the campaigns initiated by his uncle, reduced the armies of the States General, concluded an agreement with the Walloon provinces and out-manoeuvred the Prince of Orange. These events taxed to the utmost his diplomatic skill, his military genius, his statesmanship, his physical energy and his character. The facts are marshalled with skill and narrated with interest.

Volume III continues the story until 1584, explains how Farnese organized the national army and finally won over the Walloons to accepting a foreign army. This part of Farnese's career has never been so carefully and fully treated and is of special interest. The story of how he forced Orange to seek the foreign aid he despised and how he rendered null the value of Anjou's aid, is well told and does not depart from the documents. The scope of his military plans culminating in the fall of Antwerp and their close connection with the psychological and economic elements in the situation reveal Farnese's splendid abilities in the highest degree. Always he had the handicaps of Philip's slower mind, his single idea to delay in the hope that out of the delay could come the peace which Farnese saw could not be won without war, and of the lack of a fleet, of men, of money, of equipment which Philip was powerless to give him. This volume also narrates the failure of Philip's attempt once more to use the divided

command. It closes with the discussion of the assassination of Orange and the attitude of Farnese to this. We await with eagerness the appearance of Volume IV and the final summary of the career of Farnese.

Amid such a span of events it is difficult to make selections for comment as one fears to upset the balance of the picture so delicately established. Always M. van der Essen keeps in mind his objective which is to present the soldier, the statesman, the diplomat and the Catholic gentleman, and to show to what extent he excelled in each character. If the details of some events may seem too long to some, for example the military sieges, and in other points too brief as in his friendship with Don Juan and the influence of Maria of Portugal, upon reflection the reader will decide the proportion is just.

Though this is primarily a biographical study, M. van der Essen is not unmindful of the problem in the philosophy of history it presents. For those in the United States not familiar with this period, a summary of the situation as it had developed before the coming of Farnese to the Low Countries would have been useful, but it is not essential to the understanding of the work Farnese had to do since the elements of the problem are clearly stated and the issues defined. The problem was how to save the unity of Christendom on the principles of a Catholic social order, and the issues involved were what concessions should be granted to a rising national feeling and to an encroaching economic self-interest. When we write "national" feeling, we do not mean, nor does M. van der Essen, what passes today for a definition of national. We mean a psychological distinction whereby Walloon is Walloon and not Spanish, and Spanish is Spanish and not Walloon, though both are Catholic and understand each other. The Walloon wished to be individual, but did not identify individuality with independence. It was Calvinism that spread that specious idea, and by pursuing it amid all the confusion of current talk with the vigor of a one-track mind, drove the Spaniards to overemphasize their *dominio* (*i. e.*, authority)[1] and thus to lose the Low Countries. It was Calvinism also that forced the Flemings to overemphasize their commercial interests and to identify them with self-interest in a peculiar, exclusive manner, familiar now though then a novelty.

From another angle, the problem was one of a cleavage in the Catholic ranks. Requesens, governor before Don Juan, had drawn up a report on the situation for Philip. He considered there were four main groups: a minority for the Catholic religion and Spain, an anti-Catholic and anti-

[1] One must be careful in translating this word. It has two distinct meanings in Roman Stoic thought, command and will; in Christian thought authority and power, neither absolute. Cf. Madden, *Political Theory and Law in Medieval Spain*. Philip's reign saw the confusing of the two definitions.

Spanish minority, the Catholics who wanted war for the profit there was in it, and the majority who felt that the good of the country could be best secured by an accord with Spain which would guarantee their liberties, but there must be no foreign army. The objectives of Philip's policy were peace and unity. He considered that this fourth group was sufficiently influential to secure this and he clung to this hope despite all argument until every possible attempt to accomplish it broke in his hands.

Farnese with his Italian realism strove to achieve what peace and unity were possible in the situation. For this task he was at the height of his powers, presenting a martial and elegant figure, exercising indomitable and tranquil courage, generous, prudent, cautious but once resolved on a course, immoveable. Those who know of him only from the pages of Motley will be surprised to find how the facts bear out this picture of him presented by M. van der Essen. Farnese knew his Flemings. He saw there was a tendency among them to be on both sides of the fence. They wished to have the Spanish army depart but they favored a French alliance; they desired the Archduke Mathias as governor but also the confirmation of all the acts of the rebel government. He held that the people could be led but not forced, but as a military man he knew that force was necessary. He was convinced that Requesens' second and third groups were just strong enough to wreck any scheme Philip might have to establish peace with the aid of the fourth group. To prevent this war would be necessary and for this the foreign army was a necessity, at least until a national army could be trained, though he did not think this would ever match the disciplined Spanish *tercios*. As for the hope of winning over Orange, this he knew to be vain from the start. He had as few illusions on the efforts of the Emperor to bring about peace. So he addressed himself to the task of winning over Philip to his view: that he must divide his enemies, isolate the influence of Orange, destroy the value of the French aid of Anjou and thus save the Walloon provinces for the Catholic religion and Spain. This was the irreducible minimum but it was possible. The king wished first to explore all avenues of approach and to this Farnese yielded, meantime preparing his plans and manipulating the negotiations at Arras for a treaty of peace so that it could be the preliminary basis for the separation of the provinces. Strangely enough it was Orange who tipped the scales in his favor. At Arras his faction raised the point: was a difference of religion a strong enough motive to destroy a union such as had been won by the pacification of Ghent? The Flemings decided it was, and Farnese was quick to clinch the victory with the conquest of Maestricht. He pursued the same tactics at Cologne, from which conference Philip hoped so much and from which he hoped that the Walloons would be finally convinced of the futility of any peace from Orange.

Philip finally gave in to a separate peace but was unwilling to leave the disposition of Orange to time and Farnese. For once his famous patience failed him. For a long time Orange had been angling to put himself into a position which would anger Philip to the point of putting a price upon his head. Such a project had been presented by Albornoz, the secretary to Alba, and was favored by Cardinal Granvelle. Philip ordered the proscription and though Farnese considered it inopportune, he laid it before the Council of State. It would have been better to leave Orange to the fate of war, perhaps, but the majority were with Philip and Orange met his fate. Such an act was in accord with the spirit of the times and not unacceptable to Farnese and for this he cannot be blamed. Aside from the affair at Sichem early in his career and before he had disciplined himself, his character never descended to revenge. He was a soldier in the highest sense and while self-contained beyond most men, he could give himself.

A word of appreciation must be said for the description of the campaigns and battles. They are vividly and exactly told. One lives through the stress and strain and joy of the fight. The understanding of the strategic importance of the campaigns would be aided by maps of the region but even the non-military mind will appreciate the military talents of Farnese and thrill to the valor and spirit of the soldiers. The volumes are beautifully printed with choice illustrations. We hope that this admirable study of a great man will be translated into English so that a wider audience in this country may enjoy its excellence. It forms an important supplement to the study of the reigns of Charles V and Philip II written by Professor Merrimam of Harvard University. M. van der Essen has no thesis; he narrates history. While he is primarily concerned with this period as the foundation of Belgium, it is from such studies (and may their number increase) that the legend not to say myth of the Rise and Fall of the Spanish Empire will finally and mortally receive its death-blow.

M. R. Madden.

Fordham University.

The Chinese: Their History and Culture. By Kenneth Scott Latourette. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1934. 2 vols. Pp. xiv, 506, 389. $7.50 each.)

Intending in this work, unlike his briefer introductory *Development of China* (1917), to give "a fairly full summary of what is known about the Chinese" (I, x), Prof. Latourette handles a wide range of interests with incisive Gallic terseness. The first volume opens with a thirty-page description of the geography, climate, and natural resources of China, and their

influence on the people, particularly the division between North and South. The rest of the first volume (more than half of the whole work) is devoted to the connected history of the Chinese from earliest times to the summer of 1933. The second and shorter volume deals topically with population, government, economic and social organization, religion, art, language, literature, and education, including under each of these special detailed histories the essential elements which were imbedded in the general historical synthesis of the first volume. The concluding ten-page summary of the whole work is a model of meaty lucidity and conciseness. Many are already hailing the work as the first great successor to S. Wells Williams' *The Middle Kingdom*.

Not only has Prof. Latourette's work the advantage of frequent summaries and recapitulations, but the writing is careful. "Soggy with qualifications" one reviewer has already called it. But in a relatively short work for so vast a subject, at least that much qualification must be expected, if facile readers are not to be sent forth inflated with a few windy generalities. So with regard to the barrage of theories on Chinese origins (I, 33-34), we are told the picture is still incomplete. Much that has been said of their early social and economic organization is denominated conjectural (I, 57). Nor does he gush too strongly over Western influence on China, which has really only etched the edges. Not far from the coast, we are reminded, girl babies are still killed (II, 197), queues still worn (II, 237), feminine feet still bound (II, 237). But this care does not seem to extend to the author's outlook and formation as a one-time member of Yale-in-China. The statement, "As any vital religion will do, Buddhism developed sects" (I, 178), is an early hint. There is also his treatment of early Chinese religion, where although the corruption theory is mentioned, the thesis of animism as primitive and original is for many readers given the advantage by calling it "the present tendency" (II, 120), which is at least highly debatable considering the eminence of Father Schmidt's supreme Sky God thesis and the influence of *Anthropos*. But more vexing are the poisoning sinuosities of omission and inference by this authority on Chinese mission history (*History of the Christian Missions in China*, 1929), especially in view of the atmosphere of urbane disinterestedness and healthy impartiality within which they float. How long, for instance, will Catholics have to listen to the usual statement that in the late 19th century Protestant missions grew more rapidly than Catholic, which is true *proportionately* (since the Protestants had hardly any before 1860), but certainly not as to *absolute numbers*. His own figures on the 20th century make this clear (I, 483). And he fails to interpret these figures fully. A little division shows the Protestants with only 56 converts per missioner, the Catholics with 735. Protestant missioners are at various points (I, 394, 484-5) made chiefly responsible for introduction of west-

ern medicine and ideas, which is debatable, but what is more important, with no indication of the fundamental question of what is the prime object of mission work. "Impression on the Chinese" is considered in terms of expensive plant, staff, material influence, and influence with the ruling clique. Here a significant statement like the following makes us think of other originally more Catholic lands: "Protestant missions and the Protestant Christian community were having an influence quite out of proportion to their numerical strength. . . Several of the nation's outstanding political leaders were baptized Protestant Christians — among them Sun Yat-sen, Feng Yü-hsiang, Chiang Kai-shek, and some of the heads of ministries of the Nanking Government." (I, 484; also II, 173 in education.) Here it is also significant that of the Chinese Communist movement against capitalism he has to report that the native feeling was much greater against Protestant than Catholic missioners (I, 485) and that they left (or had to leave) in much greater numbers (I, 486). And can we be ready to accept Prof. Latourette's statement that for China "only . . . birth control can ward off disaster" (II, 24), based, too, as it is, on the argument that industry *has* not permanently solved the population problem of Great Britain and Japan?

Chinese life, Prof. Latourette feels, both has its similarities to Western life (as the "poker face" and blandness, and even "face-saving") and its contrasts thereto. Among the most significant of the contrasts was their elevation of the scholar (II, 344-5). They did not have to contend with our Western demoralizing superiority of the athlete over the scholar in popular estimation. And another product they apparently did well without was the modern stock company (II, 67), using instead a curiously medieval co-operative guild and family system of social solidarity, which also constituted much of their government. The central problem he feels is the vicious circle of political chaos and insufficiency of sustenance, so that any solution must be at once political and economic (II, 115). And by raising the standards of over 400 millions, the rest of the world cannot but be benefited, instead of injured through their industrialization, which of course raises the question for Catholics whether this industrialization should be by the kind of un-Christian exploitive capitalism we have had since the end of the Middle Ages. But Prof. Latourette does not neglect the spiritual problem: "Philosophically and religiously young China is wandering and only feebly or uncertainly struggling for a way out, and displays much of shallow, imperfectly thought-out materialism and pragmatism" (II, 177). Not yet accustomed to act under the new forms, he feels they are too ready to follow, sheeplike, any resolute leader.

But what cannot help striking many, most of all, is the remarkable parallelism throughout, between Eastern and Western history: *e. g.*, Buddhism, the Greek awakening, and a number of other great religious,

spiritual and commercial awakenings coming about the same time; the Han dynasty rivaling Rome; a succeeding Chinese break-up and Dark Age as in the West, with a Tang parallel to the Carolingian interlude, only greater in the extent of its empire; a Japan slowly rising, like a Britain on the outskirts, originally conquered and civilized from the mainland, later to dominate it; a synthetic genius like St. Thomas (Chu Hsi) about the same time, whose views were to be basic for centuries; the experience of Hunnish, Mongol and other invaders, though generally a little earlier than the West and influencing them more; K'ang Hsi a Louis XIV; the "1848 rebellion" the Chinese had (Taipings) being the greatest of them all; etc. Perhaps a separate summary chapter on all this would have been desirable. Indeed there is urgent demand in view of the now close conjunction of East and West at so many points, for a new one-volume world history along these lines, a real history of Civilization, not merely of European Civilization.

MAJOR L. J. YOUNCE.

Marquette University.

Restoration. By ROSS J. S. HOFFMAN. (New York: Sheed & Ward. 1934. Pp. x, 205. $1.50.)

Instaurare omnia in Christo, the motto of Pius X, suggested the title of this stimulating short essay in apologetic, which the author introduces with a personal *apologia* for his recent conversion to the Catholic Church. Through his historical studies (pp. 30-44) Dr. Hoffman was fully convinced of the uniqueness of the Church before he could even accept the credibility of theism. He was long held back from faith by the influence of what he calls the "ripened skepticism" of the modern mentality. In this case, in contrast to the experiences of most of the Tractarians of a century ago, and in our own times of Father Ronald Knox and W. E. Orchard, and parallel to the cases of Arthur Lunn and Stanley Bromfield James among recent converts, faith came otherwise than as the crowning of years of persevering evangelical convictions. To the young Hoffman, mainly preoccupied with the secular aspects of inquiry, Christian beliefs as distorted by Protestant tradition had always seemed untenable, and in the purview of his argument, are still treated as negligible. He addresses himself "primarily to that increasing number of us whose lives have been corroded by what Mr. Walter Lippmann . . . has so excellently called 'the acids of modernity'" (pp. 3-6, 202-204).

The author, now a member of the faculty of Washington College, New York University, was goaded to his spiritual quest by that uneasy "social conscience" which a generation ago began to be appalled at the inhumanities which since the Renaissance period have been inseparable from

the developments of economic order, and by the moral insensibility of the theories upon which these developments have been justified or accepted as inevitable (pp. 25-29). Disillusion and criticism later revealed to him the anarchy and the irrationality of post-Renaissance cultural trend. He now sees the intellectual forces of today, divided between uncoordinated departments of knowledge, dreading any discipline of rational principles as a menace of "ideology," and as a consequence impotent to resist the stupefying fascination of fatalist and materialist perspectives. "The mind loses all hold upon objectivity, and from being the faculty by which man *knows* the universe it becomes a mere organ for manipulating a biological environment, and not to be trusted overmuch for that" (p. 155). A sense of imminent social crisis, even of catastrophe, for which any available "brain trust" in our time must be wholly unfitted to cope, imparts a note of urgency, however restrained by trust in Providence and by deference to longer Catholic experience than his own, to the author's argument.

Dr. Hoffman feels certain that the crisis cannot eventuate in chaos: an order of some sort is sure to emerge. He seems to dismiss Fascism as an expedient likely to be tolerated, if at all, only so long as its suspension of free institutions can be trusted to serve for protection of their ultimate sanctions: the eventual issue is between Marxist slavery and an order of clearly delimited liberties. Will it be, he asks, the order of the Vatican, or of Moscow? Hope for the future is discerned in the power and initiative with which the democratic movement has succeeded in investing governments like our own, a power of which liberalism would willingly have shorn them (pp. 137-140). The political problem, as here stated, is how liberties can be saved from liberalism; how, in other words, to give the State enough judicial detachment so that it can exercise a substantive authority to define the limits of human rights, and protect them within those limits — so that free institutions may not perish in a mutual death-struggle, as a result of their resistance to definition and correlation.

Dr. Hoffman has the merit of stating American social problems in terms of American difficulties and opportunities, and in such a way that the pertinence of Catholic apologetic is inescapable in the connection. His statement of the task at once precipitates the question: How is it possible to hope for a public opinion convinced, determined and ethically enlightened enough to support such an objective? He has no other answer than to adduce from his experience and observation, evidences that there are many of the modern-minded who "really care about the terrifying drift of things," and who are in danger of succumbing in a kind of despair to the atheistical solution, unless before their eyes is flung "the ringing challenge of the Church." He has no impatient reproaches for the counsel

of those who would keep Catholics (if they could) aloof from the world's Gadarene madness. Genuine faith, he fully admits (p. 202), not social action, is of the first importance. Yet the papal utterances of recent decades encourage him to insist that the Church is now calling for a "courageous apostolate," and the Catholic revival in several non-Catholic countries gives him evidence that the call is being heeded: "Our chieftain does not despair of the world . . . he bids us go forward and conquer it."

This book inspires renewed hope of special opportunity, in our time, for telling the whole story of the Church's action upon the life of mankind — not only to save from the drift of disillusion those whose lives have been corroded "by the acids of modernity," but to encourage those whose spiritual search for faith has been persevering enough to enable them to resist those acids.

W. T. M. GAMBLE.

Washington, D. C.

Martin Luther, Germany's Angry Man. By ABRAM LIPSKY. (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company. 1933. Pp. 305. $3.00.)

Dr. Lipsky's biography of Luther has been advertised as "Wholly impartial . . . free from the bias of any religious group." A careful examination of the volume does not leave a discriminating reader with precisely that impression. It is true, to be sure, that no vestige of bias toward the old Church is to be found. The author's enthusiasm for "the vitality of religious truth that energized his (Luther's) work," his upholding of Luther's "freeing reason from the bondage of authority," and his dogmatic statement that "he (Luther) was equipped with a truth of great vital significance," might engender a suspicion that his sympathies are rather with the Angry Man's programme.

In his picture of the passionate, wrathful monk in his early career of righteous indignation against the abuses perpetrated by certain churchmen, and in his later trampling of all religious authority under foot and setting himself up as arbiter in matters of faith and morals, there is nothing new in substance. The author's method of presentation is the distinguishing thing here. He succeeds admirably in returning to the early sixteenth century and there assuming the rôle of an unenlightened critic who utters the most bumptious and sardonic pronouncements on matters about which his knowledge is imagined rather than real. It would be difficult to conceive a better reproduction of the mental malady that afflicted Luther's period than the author gives in this rôle. The single illustration of the author's complete assurance in offering the doctrine of the Immacu-

late Conception as identical with the Virgin Birth will make this point clear.

Dr. Lipsky's private interpretation of the truth that he sees in Luther's teaching is probably the mark upon which he depends to differentiate his biography from many another. But it soon becomes evident that he misinterprets St. Paul on "justification by faith" as successfully as did Luther himself. One leaves his Chapter III which treats of "Identification with God" with Hamlet's "words, words, words," on one's lips. Masters of religious mysticism have lived and have written. They are not Matthew Arnold, nor yet Dean Inge. Such masters do not use "*unity* of the self with God" or "*identification* with Christ," because the phrases are meaningless. It requires neither inspiration, which Luther claimed, nor an appeal to an unintelligible mysticism, such as is made by the author, to grasp what St. Paul means by "justification by faith." A glance at St. Paul's problem of trying to save his converts from meddling Judaisers who were trying to impose on them the *works* of the old law as necessary for salvation, will acquaint anyone with his attitude towards *works*. His reiterated insistence upon faith in Christ as the new life principle that must live in every man and be his salvation, in refutation of the claims of these Judaisers, makes clear what he means by "justification by faith."

Dr. Lipsky, presenting as he does a work for popular consumption, neither annotates nor documents specifically. He appends, however, a useful bibliography, including the names of Denifle, Grisar and Weiss. Denifle, by the way, who was of course a Dominican, is named in the author's preface as a Jesuit.

LINDA MALEY O'HARA.

Brookland, D. C.

Reformationsgeschichtliches aus Kursachsen: Vertreibung der Franziskaner aus Altenburg und Zwickau. By Dr. P. FERDINAND DOELLE, O. F. M. (Muenster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1933. Pp. xxiv, 300. 14:30 RM.)

Monographs of a scholarly character, such as presented in this volume, are extremely valuable and altogether indispensable for an adequate estimate of the stand which the so-called "old Orders" maintained in the beginning of the Lutheran revolt in Germany. No wonder Luther detested among other "loyalists" the Franciscans and feared the "Baarfuessler" as his most dangerous, because his most determined, opponents. Not only in Altenburg and Zwickau, as shown in the present volume, but also in other sections of Germany, the efforts of the Franciscans to stem the influence and to counteract the effects of the Lutheran heresy deserve more recognition than is usually accorded them. If Southern Germany as a

whole remained loyal to the Church or soon reaffirmed this loyalty, it was in great measure because of the "old Orders." The Franciscans especially set the example of loyalty and by the spoken and written word combatted heresy and schism; and thus in a way they made possible and paved the way for the great Council of Trent.

That Luther himself, as we learn from this study, personally directed the "Reformation" in Altenburg and Zwickau lends special interest to the volume. It is a story of chicanery and intolerance on the part of petty town officials and it offers another instance to prove that Luther from the start invoked the power of the State to carry out his pretended reformation of the Church. The study shows also in what poverty and destitution the Franciscans were living at the time and with what selfish greed civil officers carried on the devilish work of confiscation and spoliation.

In the section entitled "Ergebnisse" (pp. 157-218), Dr. Doelle discusses various phases of the Lutheran revolt more or less connected with the friaries of Altenburg and Zwickau. The third discussion on "Klosterbiblioteken" is particularly valuable and should be read by such as imagine that the Franciscans, during the centuries preceding the so-called Reformation, undertook little and achieved less in the way of either producing, transcribing, and illuminating books or collecting and preserving them in their libraries. The last portion of the volume (pp. 219-292) presents under the title "Beilagen" forty-two contemporary documents in old German that bear on the history of the friaries of Altenburg and Zwickau.

FRANCIS BORGIA STECK, O. F. M.

The Catholic University of America.

Il Cardinale Merry del Val. By Mons. PIO CENCI. (Rome: Berruti. 1933. Pp. 875.)

Rafael, Cardinal Merry del Val. By F. A. FARBES. (London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1934. Pp. 179.)

Inasmuch as the author of this first-mentioned *vita* is the keeper of the Secret Archives of the Vatican, and the Cardinal Secretary of State contributes the preface, it may be fairly taken for granted that this is the official, authoritative biography. It has been said that a satisfactory biography is so rare because while the people are alive to whom it refers the truth cannot be told, and after they are dead it can seldom be ascertained. This is not true of cardinals' biographies, but it is true that much that would be of interest simply cannot be divulged in the case of cardinals in Curia, particularly if they have been secretaries of state, until long years after their death when all the principles in the drama of their lives

have passed away. The reasons for these precautions are sufficiently obvious but they must be borne in mind when approaching such a biography as the present.

Monsignor Cenci tells the story of the future Cardinal's school days at Ushaw and at Brussels with perhaps just a little too much insistence, for English-readers, at least, on his youthful saintliness. His career from now on becomes one long chapter of happy accidents. He had intended to study at the Scots College, but he so impressed Leo XIII that the latter insisted on his giving up the idea of a simple missionary life in England and on his entering the College of Noble Ecclesiastics. Thus was he firmly set on the first rung of the diplomatic ladder. Hhis ensuing *carriera diplomatica* was most brilliant. When only thirty he was appointed secretary of the commission to investigate the matter of the validity of Anglican Orders. His letters show that from the very outset he, as well as his friend Cardinal Vaughan, were utterly opposed to recognition. Their attitude was much the same as that of the English hierarchy a few years ago towards the conversations held in Malines under the chairmanship of the late Cardinal Mercier. It may be noted that with the death of Cardinal Merry del Val and Cardinal Gasparri as well as that of Canon T. A. Lacey (Church of England), all those who sat on that famous commission have now passed on.

His ability as a diplomat appears to great advantage in the admirable way in which he handled the delicate school problem in Canada. On his return to Rome from this mission he was forthwith chosen President of the Academy of Noble Ecclesiastics, which carried with it a titular archbishopric. In 1903 a short time before the death of Leo XIII, Monsignor Volpini, secretary of the Consistorial Congregation, dropped dead suddenly. Cardinal Oreglia, dean of the Sacred College, proposed two names as his successor, Mons. Merry del Val and Gasparri. The former was chosen and hence became secretary of the conclave which elected Pius X, who in turn made him Secretary of State. We see him, then, Pius X's first Cardinal and Secretary of State, next only to the Pope in authority, at the early age of thirty-eight.

The recent death of Cardinal Bourne recalls the fact that Mons. Merry del Val, Abbot Gasquet, and Bishop Hedley were in the *terna* for the archbishopric of Westminster. Cardinal Satolli was for Abbot Gasquet; Cardinal Moran of Sydney at the meeting of Propaganda pleaded so eloquently (though out of his turn) for Bishop Bourne (whose name had been added to the list at the suggestion of Bishop Hedley) that Cardinal Satolli gave in and Cardinal Moran's candidate was appointed. There is no reference to this incident in the *vita*.

American readers will find most interesting the account of the bitter

controversy that arose over the proposed visit of Ex-President Roosevelt to the Vatican in May, 1910. This controversy was revived by a long letter in the February number of *Scribner's Magazine* (1920) from Roosevelt to Sir George Trevelyan. The Cardinal answered this letter in an article published in the *Civiltà Cattolica* of May 15, 1920, in which he sets forth his reasons for refusing the audience. It is a complete vindication of the stand taken by the Vatican.

The two great events of Pius X's pontificate were the complete breach with the French Government and the condemnation of Modernism. Discussing these subjects, the author quotes approvingly the dictum of a *venerando prelato* that: "In France Pius X saved the body of the Church, and in his conflict with Modernism he saved its soul, and that not in France alone."

Pius X's affection for his secretary is described at great length. After the death of the Pope, the Cardinal retired into comparative obscurity as Archpriest of St. Peter's Basilica, dwelling very simply in the Palazzina di Santa Marta, where his great predecessor as Secretary of State, Cardinal Rampolla, had died in 1913.

Nearly half this fat volume is made up of excerpts from newspapers, periodicals, and letters of contemporary admirers, attesting to the great qualities of mind and heart of this majestic, but singularly modest, Prince of the Church. This volume is a noble monument to the loyalty and affection of Mons. Cenci and Canali (to the latter of whom it owes much in the way of first-hand information); but to say that it is a great biography is another matter.

What place will Cardinal Merry del Val occupy among the great papal secretaries of state? Our author does not ask this question, feeling, and rightly so, that we are too close to the scene to pass judgment. But with all his undeniable gifts, there is reason to doubt that he will rank either with his predecessor, Rampolla, or his successor, Gasparri. The book is written in an ornate and diffuse style quite foreign to the Cardinal's manner of writing—and for that matter—of living. It contains copious appendices and indices and is indeed a beautiful specimen of Italian book-production.

The second book under review is a well written panegyric of the Cardinal. It supplements the larger work in regard to the Cardinal's relations with England and his visits there.

J. P. CHRISTOPHER.

Catholic University of America.

Commodore John Barry. By JOSEPH GURN. (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1933. Pp. x, 318. $3.50.)

Here we have a permanent contribution to American biography. In its sixteen chapters Joseph Gurn has graphically told the story of the life and deeds of "Jack Barry." In these days when "my interests" rather than "our interests" have played havoc with the social phases of our national life, it is a boon to have at hand for our American youth the life story of one whose religious teachings and training added vigor and direction to the fidelity and zeal of his citizenship.

The part played by Commodore John Barry during those trying times in which our American navy was becoming a reality makes Barry worthy of all the honors that have since been given to him. As the author points out in his first chapter, he gave of his time, his untiring energy, his resources and himself. Actual Father of our Navy, devotion to principle and readiness to serve as directed were his watchwords and ideals. He was no self-adventurer. What he did at Trenton during those perilous days is but one of the many examples of these characteristics in the conduct of Barry so well analyzed by Mr. Gurn. His loyalty to his adopted but beloved country was exemplified in his every deed, be it his spurning the attractive offer of the British naval officials after they had failed to capture him, or in his more positive and daring deeds such as his services on the *Alliance,* with Lafayette in France, as Commander of the Navy recreated in 1794; or his dynamic, mirthful, though perhaps extra-legal way of preventing procrastination from impeding the ratification of the Constitution by Pennsylvania. On that occasion some there were who must have thought him to be "Saucy" Jack Barry.

His final days and the nation's homage to him when called to his reward are equally well presented and prove a worthy conclusion to the biography of the Father of the American Navy.

LEO L. MCVAY.

The Catholic University of America.

The Secularization of the California Missions (1810-1846). By GERALD J. GEARY. (Washington: Catholic University of America. 1934. Pp. x, 205.)

The actual secularization of the California missions occurred between the years 1835 and 1846, during which time the Franciscan missionaries saw their labor of fifty years despoiled and given over to laymen. The purpose of this dissertation, done under the direction of Dr. Guilday, is to trace the secularization movement to its source and to reveal the real motives which finally resulted in its actual application to and destruction of the missions.

The California missions were begun in 1769. The idea of secularization, however, and its practical application to the missions of New Spain was developed in the preceding two centuries. In the beginning, secularization connoted merely the transfer of the missions from the religious to the secular clergy. Secularization in this sense was a logical development and followed naturally upon the establishment of dioceses; it worked harm only when applied prematurely and too extensively. The friars themselves were not opposed to secularization in this sense.

In general there were two distinct policies regarding the secularization of the missions: the one sought a gradual modification of the mission system without destroying the work of the friars, the other demanded wholesale secularization regardless of the result. It was this latter policy, coupled with local political corruption, that finally worked the ruin of the missions. This was especially true after 1813 when secularization came to include by law the administration of the mission temporalities by local military officials and administrators. This policy gained force after Mexican independence, especially when the liberal party was in control, and when finally Mexico lost control of California the foundation had been laid for the wholesale spoliation of the missions.

Dr. Geary is restrained and objective in his treatment of the subject and his thesis constitutes an excellent monograph. The volume is enhanced by a valuable bibliography and a short index.

Capuchin College,
Washington, D. C.

DONALD SHEARER, O. M. Cap.

Pedro de Alvarado Conquistador. By JOHN EOGHAN KELLY. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1932. Pp. xiv, 279. $3.00.)

The Odyssey of Cabeza de Vaca. By MORRIS BISHOP. (New York and London: The Century Company. 1933. Pp. viii, 306. $3.50.)

These biographies are, as far as I know, the first that have attempted to give a complete account of two of the most interesting of the Spanish adventurers, and for that reason are to be welcomed. Each has very real merit, and yet both are somewhat disappointing—though for different reasons. The field is still open to anyone who is capable of utilizing an opportunity. Two magnificent subjects remain to be dealt with by eventual biographers, and among the greatest services performed by Messrs. Kelly and Bishop is that of having somewhat cleared the ground. Another, and perhaps a still greater service, is that they have shown their successors what to avoid.

Each book has ample documentation, a bibliography, and an index. Each, moreover, has illustrations. Mr. Kelly, whose purpose is almost excessively sober, reproduces portraits, maps, and photographs of ruins.

Mr. Bishop, though he does not lack maps, graces his book with some of the wildest and most fascinating illustrations of De Bry. I wonder why some enterprising publisher does not re-issue the whole of this wonderful series; they are at once superb drawings and one of the most vivid spotlights of Spanish-American history, even when—as so frequently happens—they are grotesquely libelous. For they reveal, as nothing else can, the view of these astonishing matters entertained by near contemporaries.

As a historian Mr. Kelly is undoubtedly superior to Mr. Bishop. As a biographer he is undoubtedly inferior. Yet the two men reach in the end just about the same point of inadequacy. It is impossible to take Mr. Bishop very seriously; it is difficult to read Mr. Kelly. In neither case does a rounded and convincing character appear.

The business of a biographer is two-fold: he must investigate his documents; he must also deduce from his documents a living man. As Michelet was fond of saying, history is a resurrection from the dead. Put in other words this means that a historian, in order to achieve completeness, must transmute dusty scholarship into the radiance of art; though strictly controlled by fact, he must have something of the novelist's creative power.

It is at this point that Mr. Kelly fails. He has done his work with the most painstaking care. But, alas, he does not know how to write. I give two examples. On page 36 we have: "It is a curious commentary on the state of Spain in the sixteenth century that *messengers* to the most powerful temporal monarch of the time might be seized on *his* very doorstep by a Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church and held in prison while *he* filled the imperial ear with distorted versions and slanders." [My italics.] And again: "The enemy was composed of the followers of Prince Quauhtin, noted for *his* skill and ferocity, and accounted the most valiant *warriors* in the Mexican army, *who* formed the bodyguard of the Emperor" (p. 107). This bewildering confusion of antecedents indicates a lack of command of the principles of grammar, and results, even when grammar is achieved, in poor composition. The missed chance appears in its worst light when the words of Alvarado are quoted. Take, for instance, the account of the Conquistador's death (p. 214): "One of the captains bent over Alvarado, 'Where does Your Lordship feel the most pain?' The bruised lips of the Captain General moved slightly and his aide bent low to hear the murmur, 'In my soul'." How much could have been done with this heroic life if only such things had been more frequently introduced.

Mr. Bishop's defects are of a very different sort, though they damage his work even more than do those of Mr. Kelly. His style is not distinguished, but is at least vivacious. There is no harm done, and much entertainment is given, in his citation of some of the marvels recorded by the chroniclers: the bats that showed a dainty preference for the teats of pregnant sows, the crocodile which was killed by the ingenious expedient

of showing it its own atrocious face in a mirror (p. 227). What I object to is the luxuriance of his fancy: "Watching the sorrowful brown Guanches, doing the menial labors of the shore [Cabeza de Vaca] mentally asked their pardon for the cruelties of his grandfather and for those of his fellows. He prayed for the soul of Pedro de Vera and for his own, and his secret resolves were strengthened" (p. 192). How does Mr. Bishop know all this?

Again he writes: "What Narváez, with his twenty-six years' experience in handling natives, thought of this document, and what inward reservations he made, we are not informed. He certainly signed readily enough; it would go hard with him if he could not bring a pair of pasty-faced priests to a sensible way of thinking" (p. 25). It will be noted that, though "we are not informed," Mr. Bishop cheerfully informs us, and that he even knows of the priests being "pasty-faced." On the same page, with equal levity, he makes a light-hearted reference to "gay scapegraces, cardinals' nephews and such." A historian, like other men, may well be permitted to make jokes—even stale jokes; but at least he should know when to make them. And while a historian should certainly use his imagination —in the sense I have already indicated—he puts himself out of court when he indulges his propensity for fanciful speculation.

The judgment must therefore be passed that though Mr. Bishop has written a more readable book than Mr. Kelly, Mr. Kelly has produced a work of more reliability. We have here a good illustration of how the historian may fail from excess as from deficiency. Accuracy, insight, and style—all three must be possessed before first-rate work can result. Nevertheless good second-rate work may be produced by those who cannot compass all three of the necessary qualifications. Despite my strictures, I admit good work of this order has been done by both Mr. Kelly and Mr. Bishop.

THEODORE MAYNARD.

Mt. St. Mary's College,
Emmitsburg, Md.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A meeting of the executive committee of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION was held at the home of Monsignor Michael J. Splaine, Brookline, Mass., on April 25, for the purpose of arranging the programme for the XVI Annual Meeting, to be held at the Hotel Copley Plaza, Boston, Mass., December 26-28, 1935. Those present were: Rt. Rev. Msgr. M. J. Splaine, D. D., chairman of the committee on local arrangements; Jeremiah D. M. Ford, Ph. D., president of the Association; Rev. Doctors Robert H. Lord and John E. Sexton of the Brighton Seminary, Rev. Martin J. Harney, S. J., of Boston College, Rev. John A. Mullin of St. Lawrence's Church, Brookline, Mass., Rev. William J. McCarthy of St. Mary's Church, Brookline, Mass., who was elected secretary of the committee, and Rt. Rev. Msgr. Peter Guilday, secretary of the Association.

The eighth fasciscule of Dom Charles Poulet's monumental *Histoire du Christianisme* has been recently published by Beauchesne. It deals with the Christian east in the ninth and tenth centuries, the relations between the Church, the feudal system and the Empire, and the question of investitures.

The second volume of a three-volume work by René Grousset, entitled *Histoire des croisades et du royaume franc de Jérusalem*, is announed by Plon. This volume of 920 pages, containing nine maps, deals with *Monarchie musulmane et monarchie franque: L'Equilibre.*

The Clarendon Press has just issued *The Birth of the Middle Ages*, by H. St. L. B. Moss, covering the period from the death of Theodosius to the death of Charlemagne, 814.

The Rome of the Medieval Church, by Dr. Albert Mackinnon, is a bit too zealous in its studied effort to establish the Protestant position, according to a non-Catholic review.

Georges de Lagarde is the author of *La Naissance de l'ésprit laïque au déclin du moyen âge* (Edits. Béatrice). This is the fourth in a series of publications dealing with the birth of nationalism, and contains critical reflections of high order on the first symptoms of the revival of worldly self-consciousness in modern states.

The sixth volume of Henri Sée's and Armand Rébillon's *Le XVI^e siècle* appeared in April. It is entitled *Renaissance, réforme, guerres de religion.*

An addition to the history of missions has been made by R. P. Brou with the publication of his volume, *Cent ans de missions (1815-1934)*. The publishers are the Editions Spes, Paris.

Historical articles in *Speculum* for April are: American Historiography of the Middle Ages, 1884-1934, by C. W. David; Medieval Russian Contacts with the West, by Samuel H. Cross (these two are papers read at the December meeting of the American Historical Association); Glastonbury Abbey and the Fusing of English Literary Culture, by Frank H. Slover; Saints Tryphina and Hirlanda, a note by Margaret Schlauch; the Diocese of Grenoble in the Fourteenth Century, by C. R. Cheney; and Suitors and *Scabini*, by Helen M. Cam.

The International Bibliography of Historical Sciences for 1930, edited for the International Committee of Historical Sciences, Washington, D. C. (H. W. Wilson Company, New York City, 1934, pp. 515), in the composition of which the late Monsignor Lacombe of the Catholic University of America took part, contains references to thousands of volumes on the auxiliary sciences of history, general manuals, prehistory, the ancient world, Church history, the middle ages, modern times, the history of religions, intellectual movements in modern times, economics, social, legal and constitutional history, and a section devoted to the Americas up to the period of colonization. It goes without saying that this valuable bibliography like the five previously edited, is indispensable to the student and teacher of history.

In his work on *Papal Provisions*, Geoffrey Barraclough attempts to show the mistakes that have been made by students in their treatment of the system of papal appointments (Blackwell).

The Genius of the Vatican, by Robert Sencourt, is an inquiry into the part played by Rome in world affairs (Jonathan Cape).

Charles I and the Court of Rome: a Study in Seventeenth-Century Diplomacy, by the Rev. Gordon Albion, comes from the press of Burns, Oates, and Washbourne.

The American Society of Church History has published a *Bibliography of the Continental Reformation*, compiled by Professor Rolan H. Bainton, which is restricted, however, to materials available in English.

Religious Thought in France in the Nineteenth Century, by Canon W. J. Sparrow Simpson, includes notes on Positivism, Protestantism, Modernism, the Bergsonian philosophy, and Catholicism (Allen and Unwin).

Pamphlet No. 19 of the Catholic Association for International Peace is *Catholic Organization for Peace in Europe*, by Mary Catherine Schaefer (pp. 37).

Frédéric Ozanam is the title of a new biography of the founder of the St. Vincent de Paul Society; the author is F. Méjecaze.

L'Église chrétienne du Maroc et la mission franciscaine 1221-1790 (Adrien-Maisonneuve), is the title of a new study by P. H. Koehler.

Auguste Picard has announced the publication in the near future of an exhaustive study of the Inquisition during the Middle Ages by Jean Guiraud. The first of three volumes is now about to come from the press. Bearing the title *Origines de l'inquisition dans le midi de la France. Cathares et Vaudois,* it will describe the measures that were taken by the Church during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries to suppress contemporary heresies. The second volume, which is promised for the end of the year, will describe the activities of the Inquisition in Germany, Italy and Spain and will give a synthesis of the legislation and procedure of the Inquisition. The third volume is to deal with the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and will be terminated by an index of persons and places. The entire work is to be well illustrated and supplied with necessary maps.

Katholische Kirchenbauten an der Saar, by J. J. Morper, tells the story of church construction in the Saar during the post-war period.

The *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu,* January-June, 1935, contains a thoroughly documented article by P. Wilhelm Kratz dealing with the trial of Malagrida, *Der Prozess Malagrida nach den Originalakten der Inquisition im Torre do Tombo in Issabon.* The double accusation of heresy and impurity is shown to be unproven. Pombal's part in the matter met with scant approval "ausserhalb des Kreises seiner Parteigänger und der von ihm abhängigen Soldschreiber." As for the "plot," there is the critical judgment of the editor of the Tavora process: "Não ha indício de que qualquer jesuita interviesse na conjuração e muito menos a Companhia de Jesus." P. Enrique del Portillo has made the present year, which is the tercentenary of the publication of the first complete edition of the Institute of the Society, the occasion for a careful bibliographical discussion of: 1) the earliest partial editions; 2) the *Litterae Apostolicae, quibus institutio, confirmatio, et varia Privilegia continentur Societatis Jesu,* published in Antwerp "apud Ioannem Meursium" in 1635; 3) various supplements to this edition; 4) the *Epitome* or organic corpus of legislation as it appeared in 1689, and at subsequent dates. He is able to conclude: "Hemos pacientemente recogido todas las ediciones del Instituto de la Compañía, que con algún justo título, pueden llamarse *primeras ediciones.*" An important contribution to the controversy concerning Robert de Nobili is the publication, by P. Pierre Dahmen, of the full text (28 pages) of the *Votum* of Archbishop Peter Lombard of Armagh, *De controversia mota in Orientali India quoad Brachmanes recipiendos ad baptismum* . . . The point at issue was the wearing by converts of certain insignia. Lombard gives fourteen reasons for his opinion, answers objections, and decides: "permittantur et concedantur tanquam insignia et stemmata suae nobilitatis, cum protestatione . . . quod ad nullum superstitiosum usum . . . signa petant." P. Paul Dudon (the author of a recent and remarkable Life of St. Ignatius) discusses the question: *Certaines*

pages des Exercises dépendent-elles de Saint Vincent Ferrier? He decides that "la comparaison des deux écrits (de S. Vincent) avec les *Exercices* laisse l'impression nette que l'ascète du XVIe siècle n'a point démarqué celui du XVe." P. Arturo Codina in *La Estancia de S. Ignacio en el Convento de S. Esteban O. P. de Salamanca,* discusses a doubt about the historicity of the event which has been expressed by P. Carro, O. P., "en su preciosa obra *El Maestro Fr. Pedro de Soto, O. P.*" P. Codina concludes that Jesuit writers have been wrong in supposing that de Soto was at the time, 1527, Superior of S. Esteban; and that P. Carro is unwarranted in denying the substance of the story, since for that we have the evidence of St. Ignatius himself: "Mientras no se traigan argumentos firmes contra este testimonio, no se puede en sana crítica tener por legendarias las tales conversaciones." P. Augusto Coemans deals with *Duo Emendanda in Collectione "Epistularum Praepositorum Generalium."* P. Giuseppe M. March treats of the *Vicende di un Guido Reni del Gesù di Roma da Clemente XIV a Carlo III.* P. March assembles the archivistic evidence available concerning an *Ecce Homo* of Reni, of which unfortunately "non possiamo dire se ancora si conservi"; however, "noi crediamo di poter affermare con molta probabilità che la copia fatta dal Sortini si ritrova oggi nella Galleria Corsini in Rome." Thirty-eight pages are taken up with book-reviews, of which the first is that by P. Tacchi Venturi of Paul Dudon's *St. Ignace de Loyola.* P. Lamalle in his *Bibliographia de Historia S. I. pro anno 1933,* notes with brief comments, 138 items. G. G. W.

Recent publications of W. Heffner and Sons, Cambridge, Eng., include: *Edmund Campion,* by Evelyn Waugh; *Sir Thomas More,* by Professor R. W. Chambers; and the *Birth of the Middle Ages,* by H. St. L. B. Moss.

The Catholic Truth Society's Studies in Comparative Religion now include *Hinduism,* by the Rev. P. Johanns, S. J.; *Celtic and Teutonic Religions,* by Professors MacNeill and Carnoy; the *Religions of Mexico and Peru,* by the Rev. Dr. G. Höltker; *Medieval Christianity,* by Christopher Dawson; the *Reformation,* by H. O. Evennett; the *Church and the Modern Age,* by Christopher Hollis; and *Methodism,* by Father Burbridge, S. J. Among the society's new pamphlets are *Catholic Winchester,* by Msgr. J. H. King; and an *Era of Revolution,* by Mother Keppel, forming Part IX of the *Story of the Church* and beginning with the French Revolution.

Fisher and More, by Father H. E. G. Rope, is one of the several works born of their recent canonization (Alexander Ouseley).

Messrs. Burns, Oates and Washbourne have recently issued *The Story of the Catholic Church under Henry VIII as told by a Protestant Contemporary, John Stow* (pp. 40). The brochure, edited by Fathers New-

digate, S. J., and Dignam, S. J., consists of a series of excerpts from Stow's *Annales* (1605).

The Eucharistic Congress committee has published an account of the ceremonies which took place at the magnificent demonstration in Dublin in 1932, together with all the discourses delivered at the Congress, in two large volumes under the editorship of Canon Patrick Boylan. Among the discourses is one entitled The Contribution of the Irish Laity to the Catholic Church in the United States (vol. II, pp. 418-432), by Monsignor Guilday.

To the March number of *Studies* Aubrey Gwynn, S. J., contributes a study of the Black Death in Ireland; Patrick McBride discusses the Spanish Crisis; Mary T. Hayden writes on Giraldus Cambrensis; and Stephen J. Brown, S. J., on the Faith in the South Seas.

The *Dublin Review*, April number, prints an article on Francis Cardinal Bourne, by G. E. Anstruther; Some Memories of the Cardinal [Bourne], by Arthur Jackman; H. H. Pius XI as Mountaineer, by Arnold Lunn; a review of the Religious Situation in Spain, by M. L. Roberts; and a review article on the Wilfrid Wards, by Henry Tristram.

The *Report* of the annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association, 1934, prints the presidential address of Duncan McArthur on the Canadian Archives and the Writing of Canadian History. Other contents include: "Quelques Notes sur Cartier," by Gustave Lanctot; "Jacques Cartier, sa langue et sa religion," by León Gérin; and "Introduction aux voyages de Jacques Cartier: des origines à Jean Cabot," by Aristide Beaugrand-Champagne. At the May, 1935, meeting of the association Professor C. P. Stacey read a paper on the Fenian Troubles and Canadian Military Development, 1865-1871.

The annual report of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association for 1933-34 has recently been printed. The report contains the papers read at the first annual meeting (May 29-30, 1934) of the Association. Two of these are of especial interest to our readers: "Father John McKenna, Loyalist Chaplain," by the Rev. Edward Kelly, second vice-president general of the Association, and "La Mission de John Carroll au Canada in 1776 et l'Interdit du P. Floquet," by Rev. Thomas M. Charland, O. P.

The *Hibbert Journal* for April prints articles on Christianity and Hellenism, by Sir R. W. Livingstone; In Defense of Loisy, by L. J. Collins; Bede and Alcuin (735-1935), by A. L. Maycock; and Continental Protestantism and English Dissent, by T. C. Hall.

The May number of the *Clergy Review* is devoted to the canonization of SS. Thomas More and John Fisher under these topics: Thomas More, Lord Chancellor, by Lord Russell of Killowen; Blessed Thomas More as

the Patron of Laymen, by the Rev. David Mathew; B. John Fisher and Cambridge, by H. O. Evennett; B. Thomas More and the Papacy, by the Rev. R. W. Meagher; the Process of Canonization, by the Rev. Bernard W. Griffin; and Why They Died, by the Rev. Philip Hughes.

Catholic Influences in the Life of Florence Nightingale (pp. 24), has been issued as Bulletin No. 19 of the Catholic Hospital Association of the United States and Canada, 1402 S. Grand Blvd., St. Louis.

The Division of Historical Research of Carnegie Institution of Washington has issued its annual *List of Doctoral Dissertations* now in progress in the leading universities of the country. The titles bearing directly and indirectly upon the field of Church History are too numerous to cite in these pages. As usual, topics in American history far outnumber those in all other fields combined. In this same connection it should be noted that the Library of Congress publishes each year a list of doctoral dissertations which have been printed, and that the National Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies issue conjointly a list of doctoral dissertations accepted (but not printed) by the leading universities.

At the eighteenth regular meeting of the Texas Knights of Columbus Historical commission, Dr. Paul J. Foik, C. S. C., chairman, reported that three volumes are planned to cover the mission era—the first, covering the period, 1519-1693, will be ready for publication early in the fall of the present year.

After Coronado presents in historical introduction and through documents from the archives of Spain, Mexico, and New Mexico, the record of Spanish exploration and colonization of the trans-Mississippi region from 1696 to 1727. The editor and translator is Dr. Alfred B. Thomas (University of Oklahoma Press).

Pastors who are anxious to prepare a dignified and historically accurate account of their parishes, when some important anniversary comes around, will find an excellent model in Father John B. Wuest's *History of St. Francis Church and Parish, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1859-1934.*

No American scholar today has done more to bring about a better understanding between Jews, Protestants and Catholics than the Rev. Dr. Everett R. Clinchy, Director of the National Conference of Jews and Christians. The results of his research are now embodied in a compact little volume—*All in the Name of God* (New York: John Day Co., 1934, pp. 194, $2.00). The book may be highly recommended to the Catholic scholar, cleric and lay. The annual meeting of the National Conference of Jews and Christians will be held at Williams' College, Williamstown,

Mass., August 24-30, 1935. Among the Catholics participating will be George Shuster, Michael Williams, and Carlton J. H. Hayes.

In the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* for December will be found the sixth instalment of the story of the foundation and mission of Old Saint Augustine's in Philadelphia, by the Rev. Dr. Francis E. Tourscher, O. S. A.; a continuation of Dr. Elizabeth Kite's Lafayette and His Companions on the *Victoire*; and an account of Anti-Catholic Agitation during Reconstruction, by W. A. Russ, Jr.

Articles in the June number of *Church History* concern Post-War Protestantism, by Herbert W. Schneider; Post-War Eastern Orthodox Churches, by Matthew Spinka; the Donatist Circumcellions, by R. Pierce Beaver; and the Rôle of the [Protestant] Church in Trans-Missouri, by Don W. Holter.

Mid-America for April gives an account of Nineteenth-Century Jesuit Reductions in the United States, by William P. Donnelly, S. J.; Some Contemporary References to St. Mary's Mission, by E. Harold Young; and an article on the Organization of the Catholic Church in Central Illinois, by the Rev. Dr. Thomas Cleary.

The contents of the May issue of the *Historical Bulletin* include an essay on the Legacy of Machiavelli, by Laurence K. Patterson, S. J.; a statement concerning Francisco de Florencia, S. J., 1619-1695: Our First Native-Born Priest, by Dr. J. Manuel Espinosa; and part three of Thomas F. O'Connor's bibliography of the Church in Mid-America.

The first issue of the *Journal of Southern History*, the organ of the Southern Historical Association, appeared in February with the statement that its objective is "the promotion of interest and research in southern history, the collection and preservation of the South's historical records, and the encouragement of state and local historical societies in that section to vigorous activity." Articles, documents, book reviews, and historical news and notices make up the contents of the journal. Wendell H. Stephenson, Louisiana State University, is managing editor.

The question has been asked: How many early editions of the works of Sts. John Fisher and Thomas More are in the libraries of the United States? The REVIEW will be grateful for information concerning the location and description of such. The Very Rev. Felix Felner, O. S. B., reports that the St. Vincent Archabbey Library has two volumes of Fisher. One is a duodecimo volume of 654 pp., bound in brown leather with the royal coat-of-arms in gold. The title page reads: *Assertionis Lutheranae confutatio, juxta verum et originalem archetypum, diligentissime recognita et vitiis omnibus expurgata, per Reverendum patrem Joannem Roffensem episcopum academiae Cantabrigensis Cancellarium. Anno MDXXIIII.*

A former owner of the book has written on the title-page: "Ex libris Jo. Nicolai Weislinger, SS. Theol. Polem. Cultoris. Aō. 1725." The book came to St. Vincent's as a gift of King Louis I of Bavaria, from the Royal Library, Munich. It was printed by Quentell of Cologne. The second volume, octavo, 299 leaves (only the leaves are numbered), is bound in a wooden cover with a pressed leather back. Its title reads: *De Veritate Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia, per Reverendum in Christo Patrem ac Dominum D. Johannem Roffensem Episcopum, adversus Johannem Oecolampadium. Coloniae. Anno Domini MDXXVII. Aeditio Prima.* The dedication is by the celebrated humanist, Van Graes of Deventer, then professor at the University of Cologne and editor of the printing house of Quentell. The saintly Bishop of Rochestor dedicated the work to the Most Rev. Richard (Fox), Bishop of Winchester.

Mother Marianne of Molokai, is from the pen of L. V. Jacks (Macmillan).

Documents: Five Years in America (Father Gachet's Journal, 1859, concluded; *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, March); Letters to Bishop Henni, continued (Rev. Henry Hargarten, *Salesianum*, April).

Anniversaries: *25th*: St. James Church, Jamestown, N. Y,; Church of the Incarnation, Minneapolis, Minn. *50th*: St. Joseph's, Newport, R. I. (*Providence Visitor*, May 23); Polish Seminary of SS. Cyril and Methodius, Detroit, Mich. (*Ecclesiastical Review*, June); Church of the Holy Redeemer, Marshall, Minn.; St. Patrick's, St. Paul, Minn.; Sacred Heart parish, Huron Lake, Minn.; Sisters of Loretto, Colorado Springs, Colo.; St. Vincent's Academy, Albuquerque, N. M.; St. Clare's, Oxnard, Calif. (*Los Angeles Tidings*, May 10). *75th*: St. Mary's, Fredericksburg, Va. (*Catholic Virginian*, June); Holy Cross parish, Baltimore, Md. (*Baltimore Catholic Review*, May 24, 31); Holy Angels parish, Cincinnati, O.; St. John's Academy, Indianapolis, Ind.; St. Joseph's, Waconia, Minn.; St. Mary's, Wasau, Wis.; parish of St. John the Baptist, Jefferson, Wis.; St. Boniface parish, San Francisco, Calif.; *100th*: St. Philomena's Technical School, St. Louis, Mo. *200th*: Ste. Genevieve Mission, Mo.

BRIEF NOTICES

ADAMS, GEORGE BURTON, *Constitutional History of England*, revised by Robert L. Schuyler. (New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1934, pp. xv, 590, $3.00.) This revision of the masterful work of Professor Adams on the constitutional development of England which first appeared in 1920, is now revised by an old associate and friend, Professor Robert L. Schuyler of Columbia University. Professor Schuyler has added three new chapters on the Irish Free State and post-war developments as well as rewriting the chapter on "The World War." The general bibliography has been brought up to date with helpful critical notes on the materials appearing in the field since 1920. Additions have also been made to the bibliographical notes at the end of the individual chapters. This reappearance of a standard work in up-to-date attire is a welcome addition. (JOHN TRACY ELLIS.)

ADAMS, JAMES TRUSLOW, *America's Tragedy*. (New York and London, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934, pp. vi, 415, $3.00.) Mr. Adams's latest book, *America's Tragedy*, is a good example of his special ability to make scenes of United States history come to life before his readers. In the volume under review he presents a graphic picture of events which led to the Civil War, and of happenings which occurred during the war and reconstruction period. An attempt to compress such an extensive field of history into a single volume lays the author open to criticism for his chosen basis of selection. He realizes this and explains his silence with regard to certain phases of the question by the statement that his is "a general narrative, which attempts to deal rather with the causes and background of the tragedy than with details of specific events" (p. 241). It may be said, in passing, that Chapter III, "The Background, 1820-1860," is a rather remarkable condensation of the situation, North and South, just before the war. Lucid style and well chosen examples make that difficult era with all its conflicting emotionalism resolve itself into a rather simplified pattern of trends. However, as one reads further in the book, it becomes apparent that the means by which this effect is accomplished is one which eliminates certain "causes and backgrounds" altogether when to mention them might confuse the major issue. Sectionalism becomes the theme around which other events arrange themselves. If they cannot so arrange themselves they are left out. That Mr. Adams voluntarily chose this method of procedure is evident from a sentence in his preface, where he says: "The author has attempted to trace from the beginning the rise of that unhappy sectionalism between North and South which incidentally involved us in the greatest war we have ever fought. . . ." Undoubtedly he will be condemned by some for what may described by them as undertaking his work with a bias. Mr. Adams has a way of provoking processes of thought even when he does not develop them at length. An instance illustrative of this gift may be found where he treats of the theory of revolution (p. 186). Subjects are justified in rebelling against a tyrant; but he asks who was to determine

whether the attitude of the North toward certain property of the South was, or was not tyranny? Another idea offering food for consideration deals with the part "state's rights" had in defeating the Confederacy. The internal difficulties arising from this policy are clearly put (pp. 198-9 and 237-8). The author's picture of the sufferings occasioned by the war would offer a profitable study to all those who today are so heedlessly militaristic (pp. 300-312). Throughout the book much light is thrown on constitutional interpretation, though, many will disagree with the final inference that seems to suggest Socialism as in accord with a loose interpretation of the Constitution (pp. 404-405). Another point that is open to controversy is his apparent justification of an attack on non-combatants in time of war (pp. 138-139). Despite what may be said in criticism, Mr. Adams's book is a worthwhile contribution to the literature of the Civil War, and will take its place with his other volumes on the book shelves of those interested in America's development. (RAPHAEL N. HAMILTON, S. J.)

ARMSTRONG, HAMILTON FISH, *Europe between Wars?* (New York, Macmillan, 1934, pp. 115, $1.25.) Returning from Europe last summer, the editor of *Foreign Affairs* saw little hope of peace, and set down the reasons for his point of view in this slender volume of speculative analysis. The years between 1918 and the present seem to him merely the breathing spell during which a spent belligerent might gather its forces for a new engagement. It is only a question of time before the war that began in 1914 will renew itself—with what new alignments?

Mr. Armstrong begins his book on a cynical note that he does not entirely sustain throughout its pages. He sees no divergence of aim, merely one of method and of time, between present-day German radicals and reactionaries. Germany, re-arming and again seeking the hegemony of Europe, has re-engaged upon the "Drang nach Osten," with union with Austria its immediate objective. Austria holds the key position, on which the position and fate of the other powers will depend. The Austrian Government, hung on the horns of an economic and military dilemma, must choose between Italy and Germany, neither of whom wishes her independent. Seeing this, France, Russia, and the Little Entente are tending toward a policy of common action. Although the book was published before the assassinations of Chancellor Dollfuss, King Alexander, and Barthou, it throws considerable light on these events, and foretells a number of developments that have occurred since that time. In closing, the author poses, without attempting to answer, the question of the immediate future, and expresses a desire rather than a hope for collective action for security, and a sincere trial of economic democracy. He admits without discussion the possibility that either a religious controversy or an economic failure might retard the Nazi program of aggressive action. The sole beam of light in his dark picture comes from the democracies of England, France and the United States. Will they attain self-discipline and order without dictatorship?—on this query he ends. (ELIZABETH LYNSKEY.)

BARON, MARCEL, S. J., *Douze Retraites du Mois.* (Paris, Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1934, pp. 357.) The author, experienced in giving retreats,

presents in this volume a series of twelve topics which should appeal to anyone concerned with his spiritual welfare. (P. B.)

BARZUN, JACQUES, *The French Race.* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1932, pp. 275.) This is an excellent exposition of the testimony of historians and the controversial claims of theorists as to the real origin of the French race. From the Renaissance to the Revolution the literature on this question has been abundant, featuring among other names those of Bodin, Pasquier, Abbé Dubos, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Mably. The author in following the constant transformation of the issue passes their opinions in review. It becomes evident that much of what they wrote had little historical basis and that subjectivity, ignorance and prejudice colored their judgments. Similarly, adherence to one or the other theory of the origin of the French- or Latin-Nordic led to social and political upheavals which on several occasions in the course of three centuries, influenced the development of the French state. This is an impartial, well documented book which does not solve the original problem but which sums up both sides of the question, as well as the efforts of their champions. (BERNARD A. FACTEAU.)

BENOIST, CHARLES, *Souvenirs de Charles Benoist, Membre de L'Institut, Ancien Député de Paris, Ancient Ministre de France à La Haye.* Tome II. 1894-1902: *A Travers L'Europe: Belgique, Pays-Bas, Suisse, Espagne, Autriche-Hongrie, Bohême.* Tome III. 1902-1933: *Vie Parlementaire. Vie Diplomatique.* (Paris, Librairie Plon, 1934, pp. xxxvi, 464, 487, 36 fr. each volume.) The former editor of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* in the second volume of his *Souvenirs* takes his readers on a journey through Europe, not to see the countries, but to get in touch with the most prominent men of the age, prior to the World War. In the third volume Benoist speaks of his own share in politics and in the diplomatic service covering the whole period before, during and after the War. Everywhere he shows himself a keen observer of men and events and a great sketcher of characters, a painter of portraits, for which the originals in many cases would hardly be grateful. Of the 1800 persons or so that move through these pages, several hundreds are real character paintings, colored no doubt to some extent by Benoist's own political sentiments. Ribot, Rouvier, Clémenceau, Briand, Combes, Delcassé, Barthou, Caillaux can be seen at short range, shorn of the glamor thrown about them by events in which they figure. In the second volume I would call especial attention to the pages dealing with conditions in Spain at the time of, or shortly prior to, the revolutionary movements in Cuba and the Philippines; in the third volume, to the religious crisis in France at the beginning of this century, marked by the expulsion of the religious, the confiscation of their property, the severance of relations with the Holy See, and so forth. These souvenirs make interesting and instructive reading. (A. BELLWALD, S. M.)

BRANDHUBER, GEORGE, C. SS. R. (Ed.), *Die Redemptoristen: 1732-1932.* (Bamberg, Otto-Verlag, 1932, pp. 295.) Anyone desiring to know the life and work of the Redemptorist Fathers throughout the world can readily find it in this well-printed volume. In the opinion of the reviewer no one volume in

English can compare with it, in giving the reader a brief, clear-cut picture of the congregation founded by Saint Alphonsus over two centuries ago, for it gives a view of the internal workings of that religious body as well as the more general picture of the external growth. The pen picture of Saint Alphonsus in the opening chapter, a delicate, psychological study is worthwhile. It reminds one of the picture of the saint one gets after reading his letters. There is a better balanced account of the man than is usual in a short description. The growth of the Order is told with masterful brevity, without too many statistics which are appropriately reserved for the rear. Perhaps the best part of the volume is that in which is shown the work of the Redemptorists on the inside. Here is pointed out with a sure touch, the spirit that animates the followers of Liguori. Naturally the work goes into more detail when treating of the German provinces, but a world view of the Redemptorists, the work of the home missions, the foreign missions, the new arrangement called the Hausmission and religious retreats are explained in detail. These are studies rather than statistical explanations. There is a chapter of brief biographies of the more famous Redemptorists, men whose holy lives have won for them the honors of the altar and of beatification processes. The work however is not the output of one man and at times this becomes evident in the narrative, where overlapping occurs. Still the many fine illustrations, the painstaking research and the broad world view it gives of the Redemptorists make it well worth perusal. (M. J. CURLEY, C. SS. R.)

BREHAUT, ERNEST (Tr.), *Cato the Censor on Farming.* [Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies, No. XVII, edited under the auspices of the Department of History, Columbia University.] (New York, Columbia University Press, 1933, pp. xlv, 156, $3.75.) A new translation into English of Cato's treatise *On Farming* has long been needed, as the last English version appeared in 1803. The present translation is doubly welcome, because it is smooth and above all accurate. The translator evidently prepared himself adequately for his task by a careful study of his text and of the literature dealing with Cato's treatise and with ancient agriculture in general. The long introduction and copious footnotes, which are indispensable for making an ancient technical work intelligible to the modern student, bear ample witness to the translator's familiarity with his subject. It is to be regretted, however, that he did not add a short section in the introduction on Cato the man and on the textual problems connected with the *De Agricultura.* The book is furnished with a bibliography, seven illustrations, and a good index. (MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE.)

BROWNE, LEWIS, *Since Calvary.* (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1931, pp. 443, $1.00.) The outward appearance of this handsome volume gives little indication of its contents. Its wrapper in gold and black; its crucifixes, madonnas, and aureoled saints; its attractive printing; all give the impression that it would make a suitable gift for a priest or a nun. In reality it is the work of an anti-Christian propagandist, who carries his zeal to the point of bigotry. The book definitely belongs to that class of popular literature which fills our drug-store libraries; it is a pseudo-scientific historical romance of the school of Wells and Van Loon. The book is described as an inter-

pretation of Christian history, yet on page 59 the writer admits that the circumstances surrounding the triumph of Christianity were so complex and involved and subtly concatenated as to defy complete analysis. We are not surprised to know that he regards present-day Christianity as an attempt of "cryto-sacramentalism or a vituperatively evangelistic obscurantism," "blind with terror," and "screaming curses" to clutch at fragments of their old religion, when their "familiar God" has "been banished from the sky," and "the Virgin-born Son of God from history." (EDWARD HAWKS.)

BUCKLAND, C. S. B., *Friedrich von Gentz' Relations with the British Government During the Marquis Wellesley's Foreign Secretaryship of State (1809-1812)*. (London, Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1933, pp. 40.) In this volume Mr. Buckland traces for the first time in their true sequence the events surrounding the unhappy and undeserved situation which arose between Friedrich von Gentz and Lord Wellesley. The work is based mainly upon the records of the Foreign Office; and it proves an acceptable supplement to the study of British diplomacy during the Napoleonic era. (FRANCIS SHAW GUY.)

CAMBRIDGE SUMMER SCHOOL LECTURES FOR 1933, *Our Blessed Lady*. (London, Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1934, pp. viii, 260.) England's leading scholars look at Mary from every possible angle of Catholic theology and every page of their investigation adds to the delicate beauty of the Catholic conception of our Blessed Lady. The book is pleasantly written, brilliantly clear, and theologically sound. Especially sane is the treatment of Mary as Mediatrix. The paucity of New Testament texts on Mary gives rise to a variety of interpretation which in no way mars but rather adds to the beauty of the book. The usual modern over-emphasis of the negative argument on the origin of the Rosary definitely dates the work. (R. W. FARRELL, O. P.)

CHAMBERLAIN, WILLIAM HENRY, *Russia's Iron Age*. (Boston, Little, Brown, and Company, 1934, pp. ix, 400, $4.00.) As correspondent of *The Christian Science Monitor* of Boston, Mr. Chamberlain spent the years 1922-34 in the Soviet Republic, and by numerous articles as well as by his volume on *Soviet Russia*, published in 1930, he has long established his position as one of the best-informed and most dispassionate observers of the Russian scene. His latest volume takes up the tale of the last five years: the end of the first Five Year Plan and the beginning of the second. It has been a period of storm and stress, in which "the whole quality of Soviet life has been transformed," becoming both "more dynamic and more pitiless"; for the first time in history an attempt has been made to organize, control, and revolutionize the entire life of a vast empire by state planning, and the whole world has been watching this grandiose experiment with intense interest—not a little impressed. Widely advertised triumphs there have been, chiefly in the enormous expansion of "heavy industry," the great increase in power plants, automobiles, and machines of all sorts. Private landowning has been destroyed, and, by one of the greatest revolutions in Russian history, a collectivist system of agriculture has been forced upon an unwilling peasantry. Terrible suffering has resulted

from these policies: the lowering of the already too low standards of living; the frightful famine of 1933, which the author ascribes not merely to the weather, or to the sullen resistance of the peasants to the "new serfdom" that was being forced upon them, but also to the deliberate and cold-blooded policy of the Soviet authorities; the "liquidation" of the *kulaks*, *i. e.*, of the whole class of the more well-to-do, and presumably the more ambitious and capable, peasants; the renewed persecution of the recalcitrant intelligentsia; the intensification of the abominable campaign against religion. Mr. Chamberlain writes with perfect fairness, full recognition of the brighter side of the communist system, and a keen consciousness of the weaknesses of capitalism. But his general attitude seems to be one of skepticism as to the future of the Bolshevist regime: doubt as to the practicability of state planning on the colossal scale now attempted; doubt as to the possibility of permanently maintaining the all-embracing despotism now practiced, of altering human nature and human motives to the point that Communism seems to require, and, above all, of eradicating the religious impulse. He has written an absorbing book. (R. H. LORD.)

DALGLIESH, WILBERT HAROLD, Ph. D., *The Company of the Indies in the Days of Dupleix*. (Easton, Pa., Chemical Publishing Co., 1933, pp. viii, 238.) This monograph deals with the administrative organization and the commercial activities of the Company of the Indies during the second quarter of the eighteenth century. From contemporary evidence we are shown what was taking place in the company's offices in Paris, Lorient, and in the settlements in India, how justice was administered, how the employees were treated, the soldiers and sailors recruited. Although the name of a great leader appears in the title, the author has steered clear from military history, and has succeeded in presenting a true picture of the famous company. He points out that which is too often forgotten: the close dependence of this and similar organizations upon the Crown. At the end of his study he concludes that the organization of the Company of the Indies was defective. Abuse, fraud, and mismanagement were common occurrences in Paris, Lorient, and in India. Everywhere scheming employees were found more intent in promoting their own ends regardless of the interests of the company. Many of them were incapable. The inadequate salaries paid them kept out qualified individuals, while favoritism packed the higher ranks of the organization with creatures whose only qualifications were the all-powerful influence of friends at court. Based almost exclusively on archival sources, this monograph is a distinct contribution to the history of the commercial companies in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; at the same time it furnishes a term for comparison with those companies which played an important part in the beginnings of colonization in North America. Adequate definitions of trade and administrative terms peculiar to eighteenth-century French commerce further enhance the value of this volume; one might wish, however, that the author had included them in the index. It is regrettable that the misprints were not corrected and that a uniform spelling of the names of the French officials was not adopted, but these external shortcomings do not lessen the intrinsic excellence of the book. (J. DELANGLEZ, S. J.)

DEMF, ALOIS, *Goerres spricht zu unserer Zeit.* (Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder & Co., 1933, pp. x, 221, $1.50.) Scholarly in concept and development, provocative of serious thought, and thoroughly Catholic in outlook and sentiment is this excellent study of Joseph Goerres who a century ago in disturbed Germany ranked among the foremost leaders of Catholic thought and action. Under three heads, "Vita Utopica," "Vita Activa," and "Vita Contemplativa," the author depicts the mental and spiritual stages through which Goerres passed until he found in Christ the King not only a solution of his personal soul-problems but also the solid bedrock upon which alone social well-being and political stability can be firmly and safely founded. (F. B. S.)

DERMINE, Abbé JEAN, *L'Education Chrétienne de la Personnalité.* (Brussels, Editions de la Cité Chrétienne, 1932, pp. 241.) To the man who would know history aright, a functional grasp of the problem of human personality is a *sine qua non.* It is the key that opens up the hidden motives that are in most cases the causes of those effects which we call the salient facts of history. In this volume from the pen of Abbé Jean Dermine, the Catholic student of history will find a well-balanced explanation of what the term Christian personality denotes. In the six chapters of this volume the author analyzes the concept of personality and shows how it is the true end of education when considered from a psychological point of view. In his treatment of this important problem of the education of personality, which he rightly styles the fruit of education, the author gives due regard to the principle of authority in the process of education, pointing out in a clear and distinct manner the rôles to be played by the family, the Church, and the State. His concise yet complete presentation of the relation of personality and adolescence is, if we may make a comparison, perhaps the best part of his work. This volume, although written specifically for the members of the Catholic Young Belgian Women's Association as a guide for their study of the Encyclical of Pope Pius XI on the Christian Education of Youth, will be found a serviceable volume for all interested in the problems of Christian personality. (L. L. McV.)

D'ORLIAC, JEHANNE, *Joan of Arc and Her Companions.* Authorized translation from the French by Elizabeth Abbott. (Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1934, pp. 304, $3.00.) Whereas Anatole France throws the glamour of romance and the magic of incomparable prose around his much-maligned Maid, Madame D'Orliac, obviously his disciple, writes in an abrupt and puerile fashion. Except for certain passages which appear to be a pale rendering of the master, *Joan of Arc and Her Companions* is tedious reading. Its dialogue smacks of the historical cinema. Guy Endore recently told a better story in more attractive English, and one turns with relief to Hilaire Belloc's starry tale. Madame D'Orliac never quite makes up her mind whether Joan was a "dear little saint" or a simple peasant whose divine voices were influenced by human machinations. This country drudge, grown accustomed to court luxury and martial glory, abhorred a return to Domremy. Her latest biographer goes a step further than Anatole France who affirms that the Maid always drank wine mixed with water. "We are not told," observes Madame D'Orliac,

"whether Joan loved a good table." The author is unfamiliar with the language of religion and does not understand what she terms Joan's "strange mysticism." On this last point we refer her to Père Petitot and M. Bergson. We dispute the prestige of Yolanda and such statements as "Joan never disobeyed any suggestions from the House of Anjou." Madame D'Orliac ignores the fact that the testimony concerning the Maid's alleged despair and recantation is confused. Although Charles betrayed her, another Charles, the poet Péguy of her loyal city of Orléans, wrote her perfect epitaph: *La fille de Lorraine a nulle autre pareille.* (ALICE MCLARNEY.)

DOUGLASS, H. PAUL, *Church Unity Movements in the United States.* (New York, Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1934, pp. xxxviii, 576.) One must admire the zeal and the ingenuity which produced this elaborate book. It is the fruit of four years' incessant work. Its purpose is to discover, to estimate, and to record the yearnings towards Christian unity that are so characteristic of modern Protestantism. The book is filled with statistical tables, 150 of them, which have been compiled from the answers given to a great number of questionnaires. These were sent to 20,000 persons belonging to twenty-five of the leading denominations in this country. The persons approached were carefully chosen in order to obtain a fair cross-cut section of religious opinion. The replies are bewildering. They cover every possible phase of religious thought. They are a complete demonstration to a Catholic of the hopelessness of trying to bring about reunion on the basis of individual opinion. One is tempted to think that the effort was hardly worth all the toil expended. There is, however, one valuable agreement. The idea of a Church—a united Church, and a visible Church—is not dead in Protestantism, thank God! As Catholics we ought to express our deep appreciation of the generous and respectful treatment of our position. Not one word is said to which we could object. It is understood that our belief in an indivisible Church prevents us from taking part in reunion movements. There is no hostile criticism of this. (EDWARD HAWKS.)

FAULHABER, Cardinal, Archbishop of Munich, *Judaism, Christianity and Germany.* Translated by Rev. George D. Smith. (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1934, pp. ix, 116, $1.50.) Five fine sermons delivered by Cardinal Faulhaber in his cathedral during Advent, 1933, form the contents of this book. Also "they form," as George N. Schuster says in his apt introduction, "a document of quite unusual value concerning one of the fiercest and most crucial of the many struggles through which a civilization only a little while ago termed 'modern' is now everywhere passing." No reader will deny that judgment; for these sermons are the pronouncements of a man who is a scholar, a great churchman, and a national leader. With such a combination we in this country are familiar only in theory. Equally rare among us are the style and content of these sermons, distinguished by ripeness of talent, the artistry of discipline, and the feeling of a man of God. The title may seem a rather broad one for five sermons, but their subjects will explain the title. They are: The Religious Values of the Old Testament

and Their Fulfillment in Christianity; The Ethical Values of the Old Testament and Their Perfection in the Gospel; The Social Values of the Old Testament; The Corner-Stone between Judaism and Christianity; Christianity and Germany. On these topics the Cardinal speaks as a specialist, having spent eleven years lecturing on these questions in the University of Wurzburg and having held the chair of Old Testament Scripture in the University of Strasburg. These sermons do indeed form a document of unusual value, because they are the utterances of an academician and a patriot, speaking *sub specie aeternitatis*. (THOMAS J. MCGOURTY.)

FOAKES-JACKSON, F. J., *The Church in the Middle Ages*. (Cambridge, at the University Press; New York, The Macmillan Co., 1934, pp. 153, $1.00.) This is Part II of Volume II of a series of books dealing with the *Christian Religion, Its Origin and Progress*, and designed as textbooks for boys and girls. The outline of more than a thousand years of Church history is attempted in a few pages. The task involved titanic labor on the part of the author, but the resulting compression makes the volume almost if not entirely useless for the average young student. Perhaps this is a stroke of good fortune. The general editor expresses the confidence "that anyone who reads through the three volumes will have a true perspective of the whole subject and be able to form a sound judgment of the right and the wrong of many questions in dispute today." The perspective created by this volume does not bear out the general editor's confidence; not because there is a lack of honest effort at fairness on the part of the author, but because he misconceives this thing which is the Catholic Church. His extensive study has not yielded him that knowledge without which no one is able to understand or evaluate it, namely, that it is not merely an organization but an organism of divine origin and perpetuation. The author shows signs of being near to this knowledge at least twice in his little volume when he expresses astonishment at the "almost miraculous" persistence and integrity of the Church, notwithstanding its weak or venal human officers. One regrets numerous inaccuracies—confusion of faith and credulity, discipline and doctrine, pardons and indulgences, to cite but a few—and a lack of the scientific detachment that one has a right to expect, in the author's expression of personal bias not in accord with much respectable historical opinion.

The addition to the suggested reference books to be found at the end of each chapter of the names of Catholic historians would give the earnest student a chance to examine the other side of the subject and perhaps improve his perspective. (LINDA MALEY O'HARA.)

FOX, DIXON RYAN (Ed.). *Sources of Culture in the Middle West: Backgrounds versus Frontier*. (New York, D. Appleton-Century Co., 1934, pp. 110, $1.25.) This, the first volume in the Appleton-Century Historical Essays of which Dr. William E. Lingelbach is general editor, presents three papers read at the 1933 meeting of the American Historical Association in the special session devoted to the topic "The Advance of Civilization into the Middle West." The three papers—"Political Institutions and the Frontier" by

Benjamin F. Wright, "The Advance of Civilization into the Middle West in the Period of Settlement" by Avery Craven, and "The Development of Civilization in the Middle West, 1860-1900" by John D. Hicks—are preceded by an "Editor's Explanation," and are followed by "Remarks" by Marcus L. Hansen that are really essays in themselves.

The fact that the discussion revolves around the validity of Turner's thesis of the significance of the frontier in American history makes the volume both a tribute to the influence Turner's teaching has had in the historical synthesis of the last forty years and a salutary check upon the unwarranted extents to which his interpretation has been pushed. Professor Wright, who leads the attack on Turner's thesis, may have been too severe in denouncing that thesis as "narrow and provincial," but Professor Craven, in clarifying Turner's teachings, places the doctrine within proper limits, and Professor Hicks, now holding the chair from which Turner announced his thesis, takes a middle-of-the-road position while demanding proper recognition for the influence of the West. Professor Hansen speaks of Neo-Turnerism, and pleads for keener appreciation of direct European influence. The editor repeats the interpretation he had advanced in his "Civilization in Transit" (*American Historical Review*, July, 1927).

Splendidly organized and forcefully written with fine bibliographies these essays should stimulate not only thought but also further investigation and a new synthesis. (P. RAYMOND NIELSON.)

GINZBERG, ELI, *Economics of the Bible.* (Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society of America, 1932, pp. 70.) An adequate history of the economic life of the ancient Hebrews has never been written. The present monograph does not deal with the whole economic life of Israel but with a particular phase of it, namely the Sabbatical and Jubilee rules with special emphasis on property in land. The author gives a rather full explanation of the Sabbatical and Jubilee provisions but seems doubtful of their practical enforcement and effect. These principles of rest and redemption, though perhaps never extensively enforced as parts of social practices, were nevertheless preached and must have had some noticeable effect in discouraging slave-owning, land-piracy, and usury and, at the same time, in encouraging justice and mercy in the relations of Jew with Jew. (J. S. CONSIDINE, O. P.)

GRANT, A. J. and TEMPERLEY, Harold, *Europe in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries: 1789-1932.* Fourth edition. (New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1932, pp. xxi, 652, $3.75.) This volume by the veteran English historians is a worthy addition to several good textbooks which have appeared lately on the same period. The first and larger half of the book is a good summary of the nineteenth century. It presupposes certain factual knowledge, omits England entirely, and contains not a single bibliographical reference. The second and shorter half deals with the twentieth century. Here the authors try to introduce references (very few indeed), but strangely the excellent works of American historians are not mentioned at all. Had the authors used these works, some of their conclusions, *e. g.*, the Serbian government's innocence in the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand, would have

been different. There are also expressions which sound almost shocking in a textbook which after all should not register the personal feelings of the authors. For instance: "England had begun by blockading the German Coasts and the pressure became worse and more. She held on like a bull-dog and every now and then tightened her grip and approached nearer to the throat of her rival" (p. 520). It seems that European historians cannot arrive at objectivity as yet when writing on the World War. (TIBOR KEREKES.)

GUY, Rev. FRANCIS SHAW, Ph. D., *Edmund Bailey O'Callaghan: A Study in American Historiography.* (Washington, D. C., The Catholic University of America, 1934, pp. 93.) The historiography of Edmund Bailey O'Callaghan, as the Rev. Dr. Guy presents it to us, illustrates the rare fact where the work of a man far surpasses the individual himself. In his long career we see many reflections of the origin and growth of the early medical, literary, political and above all the historical, life of New York State. His contributions to the historical culture of that excellent civilization, inhabiting the stretch of land from Quebec to New York City, were many and worth while. Born in Ireland at the time when that country was struggling for her God-given rights, love of the homeland had imbued O'Callaghan with a truly patriotic spirit, which consequently deepened his hatred for England. This hatred is evidenced particularly in the assistance he rendered in bringing about the religious emancipation of Canada. Through his literary efforts he aroused the people, whose intellectual revolt eventually brought about spiritual freedom. Among all the gifts which O'Callaghan possessed, both his love of accuracy and his care in consulting original sources—two essential factors in the writing of true history—indicate him as an outstanding historian of the first power. His *History of New Netherland* is a monumental work, and must be referred to by the future writers of the history of New York State as one of their most important source-books. Equally important is his *Documentary History of the State of New York*, which will forever win the favor of later missiologists. The work brings to us the fruit of studious research, on the part of the author, concerning a man, little known, save among a few professional historians. (MARK NOLAN, O. M. C.)

HAMMOND, MASON, *The Augustan Principate in Theory and Practice During the Julio-Claudian Period.* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1933, pp. x, 341, $3.50.) This book constitutes a new attempt to solve the problem of the precise nature of the power enjoyed by the *Princeps* in the early Roman Empire. The study reveals that the author is fully acquainted with the ancient sources and with the voluminous modern literature dealing with his theme. On the basis of a critical analysis of all this material he states among his principal conclusions that Augustus was sincere in his desire to restore the Republic, that, "far from regarding his own authority as independent of that of the Senate, through either a grant by the army, as Mommsen maintained, or an appeal directly to the populace, as Rostovtzeff held, he conceived himself to be the agent of the Senate, the permanent representation of the state," and that like Cromwell, "he was driven towards

autocracy by the abdication of the republican institutions, not by his own ambition."

Hammond's conclusions cannot be discussed properly in a notice. Let it suffice to say that, while he has not made any strikingly new contributions to the solution of the problem under investigation, he has written a solid and thoughtful book which may be considered an excellent summary of the whole question to date and a valuable help to future investigators. The book is well written and contains a practically exhaustive bibliography, and a good index. I must protest, however, against the arrangement of the notes after the text. All notes—and there are several hundred—are relegated to the back of the book, so that in checking the sources of statements made in the text one has constantly to turn to the end of the work. Such notes in an historical monograph should certainly be placed at the foot of the pages to which they apply. (M. R. P. M.)

HARING, C. H., *South American Progress.* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1934, pp. 241, $2.50.) Dr. Haring says in his preface: "The chapters which follow were prepared as lectures to be delivered at the Lowell Institute in Boston, Massachusetts, in November, 1933. Directed to a general audience, they pretend to nothing more than a rapid survey of the political evolution of the principal republics of South America, and of their international relations, since the achievement of independence. The lectures are in no sense a contribution to knowledge." Despite this warning concerning the book's lack of "contribution to knowledge," a reading of it will well repay the time of anyone interested in South America, its people and its problems. The eight chapter headings are as follows: I. Problems of Independence; II. The Rise of Modern Argentina; III. Empire and Republic in Brazil; IV. International Rivalries on the River Plate; V. The Struggle for Democracy in Chile; VI. The Balance of Power on the Pacific; VII. Church and State in Colombia; VIII. South America and the United States. The Harvard professor of Latin-American history and economics knows his subject and writes easily and competently. His views are distinctly worthy of consideration and attention. (PAUL V. MURRAY.)

HARTSHORNE, HUGH; STEARNS, HELEN R.; UPSHAW, WILLARD E., *Standards and Trends in Religious Education.* [The Institute of Social and Religious Research.] (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1933, pp. xv, 230, $2.00.) In the preface it is stated that "Part One of the present volume reports the work of the church with its children and youth while they remain at home and enrolled in its various organizations. Part Two follows the young people into college in order to describe and appraise what the church is doing for its members when they leave home and cease to come under the direct ministrations of the local institutions in which they have been reared." Such a promise must attract anyone interested in religious education, especially today "while the church as represented by the Protestant Churches at least, despite various statistical statements, is falling farther behind, year by year, in the effectiveness of its religious instruction" (Nicholas Murray Butler). If one suspects that this lamentable situation may be due to deficiencies in religious

education he has in this book an indispensable aid for learning what ten outstanding churches are doing for the pre-college age and also what is being done in religious education in 500 colleges in these United States. The churches dealt with are Baptist, United Brethren, Congregational, Disciples, Episcopal, Evangelical, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian, Reformed and others. The others, presumably a form of Protestantism, have 1.1% of the schools studied. (T. J. McGourty.)

Heuvelop, Sister Helene I. C., *Leben und Wirken Bernard Overbergs.* (Münster, Aschendorff, 1933, pp. 348.) This study was submitted as a dissertation to the department of Arts at St. Bonaventure's College, St. Bonaventure, N. Y., in parial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. In Part One the author depicts the external circumstances and the personal background of Overberg's career as educator. The extensive activity of Overberg along educational lines takes up Part Two; while the influence he exerted on his times is traced in Part Three. Educational principles, gathered from Overberg's "Anweisung" and "Tagebuch," are listed at the end of the volume. (F. B. S.)

Indirizzi e conquiste della filosofia Neo-scolastica Italiana. (Milano, Società Editrice "Vita e Pensiero," 1934, pp. v, 247.) The present book is a special supplement to the twenty-sixth volume of the *Rivista di Filosofia Neo-scolastica*, containing papers under the auspices of the Catholic University of Milan on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the foundation of the above-mentioned review. Ten authors have contributed to this special number: Masnovo, Vanni-Rovighi, Olgiati, Rotta, Padovani, Bestetti, La Pira, Rossi, Casotti, and last but not least, Agostino Gemelli, the rector of the Catholic University at Milan, who wrote two papers, the more important being the one on the attitude of Neo-Scholasticism towards modern psychology. The Italian Neo-Scholastics are to be felicitated; they may well be proud of their progress in this field. (J. J. Rolbiecki.)

Kleinschmidt, P. Beda, O. F. M., *Auslanddeutschtum und Kirche.* Zweiter Band: *Die Auslanddeutschen in Übersee.* (Münster in Westfalen, Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1930, pp. 449.) Ever since the World War there is an increased interest in Germany in the history, spiritual and material, of the emigrant Germans. Catholics of the Fatherland, perhaps more than any other group, lead in the research of this field. There is an excellent series of more than fifty volumes—under the general leadership of the veteran George Schreiber—devoted to various questions dealing with Germans in foreign countries. The volume under review (numbers 21 and 22 of the series) discusses the emigrant Germans' participation in establishing and expanding the Catholic Church in the United States and Hispanic America, and carrying the light to the "dark" continent of Africa. We meet with an impressive array of priests, bishops, monks, and nuns zealously devoted to their pastoral, missionary and charitable tasks. The author—Father Kleinschmidt, an outstanding Church historian—shows an admirable knowledge of the history of the Church in the various countries of the American con-

tinent. He is thoroughly acquainted with the existing literature; consequently, his book is more than a study from the German viewpoint: it is a history of the Church in the New World and Africa. (TIBOR KEREKES.)

LANDGRAF, ARTHUR, *Écrits Théologiques de l'École d'Abélard.* (Louvain, Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1933, pp. 328). A number of theologians have interested themselves in the writings of Pierre Abelard and of his school. Professor Landgraf gives us the critical edition of two unpublished manuscripts of the school of Abelard. The *Sententie Parisienses*, according to the offered arguments, were written between 1139-1141. The opening lines 'Tria sunt qui ad humanam salutem sunt necessaria: fides, sacramentum, caritas" certainly show the Abelardian influence; but besides, as Landgraf points out, the author quite often quotes Abelard *ad verbum*. Granted, several of the doctrines of the great theologian are omitted, yet a number of the definitions as found in the *Sententie* are exactly like those found in Abelardus' *Theologia*; definition of faith: "existimatio rerum invisibilium visui non subjacentium," the characteristic of charity: "Amor," the separation of the divinity of Christ from his humanity during the three days following his death: "Deus est substantia in corporea, homo est substantia corporea."

Ysagoge in Theologiam seems to have been written between 1148-1152. The author tells in his preface that his *Ysagoge* is not an original piece of work, but merely a narration of the doctrines of his predecessors. Who are these predecessors? Without a doubt, we may justly say that Abelard was the main source of the author, as he treats the same problems, attacks them from the same angle, and offers the same solution that Abelard had offered. With regard to the second book, the relation does not seem so evident; this seems to be purely original. But as to the third, the author again undergoes the influence of Abelard. Both of these manuscripts are published like the other volumes of the series *Spicilegium*. It is a critical edition well presented, and of great value, as Professor Landgraf in his footnotes gives us the references to Abelard, which are parallel in the manuscripts. (LEON BAISIER.)

LOWELL, A. LAWRENCE, *At War with Academic Traditions in America.* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1934, pp. xiv, 358.) Dr. Lowell has gathered together in this volume much that is of worth to all who are interested in the aims and trends of education, America's most important task. Within the 358 pages of this octavo volume such problems as the worth and art of examinations, credits and their abuses, vocational training, culture, academic freedom, the college and its relation to post-graduate work, the rôle of the dormitory in education, post-graduate degrees, research, scholarships, are treated with a masterful nicety. They are a running commentary on recent educational history. One lays this volume down with the thought that Dr. Lowell felt and aimed to realize in Harvard the best that has been preserved from those ages when scholars were men of culture. He builded in this volume better than he knew. (L. L. MCVAY.)

LUSSEAU ET COLLOMB, Abbes, *Manuel d'Études Bibliques.* Tome II: *Les*

Livres Historiques de l'A. T. (Paris, Pierre Téqui, 1934, pp. v, 1167.) These are the days of ever increasing Bible study and it is not easy to find a detailed and reliable study for Catholic students on the books of the Bible. This defect, in great part, is remedied by the *Manuel d'Études Bibliques*, the second volume of which has just been published. This volume is divided into two parts. The first part gives a critical analysis of each historical book of the Old Testament, including the Pentateuch. The second part treats of the history of the Chosen People from the origins to the end of the Maccabean era. In exposing each question the authors first insist on the traditional thesis and then briefly analyse the opposing views. They show that they are fully abreast of modern scholarship. The work excels in solidity of doctrine, clearness of exposition, wisdom and prudence in controverted subjects. A well chosen bibliography enhances the value of the book. (J. S. CONSIDINE, O. P.)

MAYNARD, THEODORE, *Preface to Poetry.* (New York, Century Publishing Co., 1933, pp. xv, 436.) Dr. Maynard has rendered poetry a great service in this work, and in writing it, he has also rendered the layman a great service. None better than the writer, who is one of America's leading poets, is better fitted to simplify the approach to his art and to bring its beauty as well as the solution of the intricacies of poetic technique within the reach of the uninitiated. In addition, Dr. Maynard has labored lovingly to illustrate each point with specimens of verse culled from the poetic literatures of the world—apt passages which prove not only his own insight into the true spirit of poetry but his familiarity with the great poets of all time. In brief, he has succeeded in describing the essence of poetry and exhibiting it in operation. In his book we have a practical and enjoyable approach to the appreciation of poetry. (BERNARD A. FACTEAU.)

MOON, PARKER THOMAS (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science.* January, 1935: *The Stabilization of Peace.* Vol. XVI, No. 2. It is not possible to compress this discussion in some fifteen addresses into a few hundred words. The best that can be done is to single out one or two points that deserve special notice. The discussion was divided into three sections, one dealing with the question of neutrality in war, largely a myth, since any large nation and even small ones become a source of supply to the combatants. As Professor Stimson points out, war and neutrality are the most profitable condition for private manufacturers of arms and supplies. Control through nationalization of munitions industries is not feasible since virtually all industries become involved in case of war. Even a nation whose inclination and policy is to remain "neutral" is *de facto* if not *de jure* a participant in the general conflict and may share in the subsequent debacle and economic chaos. Also as has been clearly proven by experience in the World War, the rights of a neutral on land or sea can only be preserved, if at all, by force. As pointed out by Mr. Charles Warren, *real* neutrality could only be maintained by viewing all exports as munitions of war. The second section deals principally with the building up of a sound international organization, which, as Professor Stimson had already stated, depends funda-

mentally upon the reform of the moral ideas and habits of all peoples. One of the great obstacles to this end is the growth of economic nationalism, which presents chaotic conditions, a way out of which is sought through the policy of self-sufficiency, tends to encourage. The only practical alternative is a federal organization of the states of the world, not in a doctrinaire sense, but, according to Professor Shotwell, through a League of Nations proceeding on realistic lines. This, in the humble opinion of the reviewer, means a long, hard struggle with nations many times on the verge of war. But it is an effort that must be undertaken by nations as by individuals. It means the education and training of the individual, morally and historically—morally because no nation can contribute to world peace until its citizens can and do apply sound moral ideas in their everyday lives and relations and translate the consequent state of society into terms of international intercourse and international law; historically, because it requires the perspective of history to realize that world unity, the breakdown of which, politically, may be placed some four hundred years ago, cannot be achieved again in a quarter of a century. That is the more hopeful view of the situation. (ELIZABETH SWEENEY.)

PERSOGLIO, LUIGI, S. J., *Catechismo sulle Quattro Parti della Dottrina Christiana ovvero Spiegazione della Dottrina Christiana.* Edizione Seconda dal P. Angelo M. Taverna d. m. C. 3 Vols. (Torino-Roma, Marietti, 1930-1934, pp. viii, 450; iv, 480; iv, 354.) This work presents a new edition of the excellent volumes of P. Persoglio, S. J. The revised edition by P. Taverna, S. J., follows the plan of the original based on the Tridentine Catechism. The first volume deals with the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Angelic Salutation and the Doxology; the second, with the Decalogue and the Precepts of the Church, and the third, with the Sacraments. The work, despite its title, is not in the form of question and answer. It is characterized by clarity of exposition and illustrated by examples, particularly from ecclesiastical history and hagiography. (G. B. S.)

REZENDE DE TAUBATE, MODESTO, and MOTTA DE PRIMEIRO, FIDELIS, O. M. Cap., *Os Missionarios Capuchinhos no Brasil: Esboco historico.* (Sao Paulo, 1930, pp. xvi, 603.) This history of the Capuchin missions in Brazil compiled by two Brazilian Capuchins is the best work on the subject which we have at present. The Capuchins have been in Brazil since the year 1612. No less than 727 names of missionaries who labored there during the last three centuries are printed in the appendix. From the very beginning up to the present times the Capuchins have devoted themselves to the Indian missions. Some of the Indian villages founded by Capuchins have developed into towns and cities. Naturally a number of missionaries were treacherously killed by the Indians. Large sections of the country were opened to colonisation by the conversion of warlike savage tribes. The missionaries built roads and railroads through the immense forests spanning many rivers by bridges. The most noted Capuchin missionary of Brazil is the Rt. Rev. Vitalis Maria Gonsalves de Oliveira, bishop of Olinda (died in 1878). The bibliography (pp. xi-xiv) omits some works published in Europe. (JOHN M. LENHART, O. M. Cap.)

SCHIAVO, GIOVANNI, *The Italians in America before the Civil War.* (New York, The Vigo Press, 1934, pp. 399, $5.00.) The author's purpose is to bring to the attention of his readers a neglected phase of American history—the contribution of the Italians. Italian discoverers, explorers and missionaries entered this land under the flags of Spain and France. Early missionaries of Italian blood came as Franciscans and Jesuits. Later immigrants, coming individually and in groups, included artisans, artists, and musicians. Toward the middle of the nineteenth century more arrived as political exiles, and a large number as religious banished by a hostile government. As compared with immigrants of other nationalities, Italians were not numerous; accordingly much space is given to expounding the claims for recognition on the part of individuals such as Chino, Tonti, Mazzei, Vigo. Concerning the American Revolution the writer says on page 266: ". . . only a few natives of Italy took an active part in the long struggle. Mazzei and Vigo, however, were worth a thousand officers." The achievements of the explorer LaSalle were rendered possible by Tonti; those of George Rogers Clark by Vigo; Chino appears to have been the outstanding missionary of the southwest; the discovery of the source of the Mississippi is attributed to an Italian. However, apart from the work of the missionaries and educators, the most notable contribution of the Italians is declared to have been in the fields of architecture, sculpture, painting, and music. The book has a synoptic table extending from the year 1492 to 1867; the bibliography covers some forty-seven pages—there is some repetition, however, since it is arranged according to chapters. From the student's point of view the work leaves something to be desired in that the exact location of cited material is not indicated; whole paragraphs are repeated; too great credence is placed in the factual character of memorials to Congress. An excellent reply to the exaggerated claims of Nordics to superiority of race and government together with a criticism of the Nordic contribution to American institutions, is given in Appendix I. Although its claims made in favor of individuals may appear not quite convincing, nevertheless the book has a place in the literature of American history; its shortcomings appear to be due to zeal for its cause. (Sister LORETTA CLARE.)

SCHNABEL, FRANZ, *Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert,* 3 Vols. (Freiburg i/B/, Herder, 1929-1934, pp. vi, 628; viii, 414; ix, 500.) In this German history of the nineteenth century we are dealing with a work of a high order indeed. The author is professor at the Technical College at Karlsruhe. To him the outbreak in 1914 of the World War means the coming to an end of one period in history and the beginning of another. The new spirit of today he claims, enables us to scan quietly the past period which is ended. Hence he examines the complex makeup of the nineteenth century in Germany. He does so quite thoroughly, as a brief summary of the contents will show. In volume I, which bears the subtitle, *die Grundlagen,* the author looks at the roots of nineteenth-century history in Germany: first, the land within its European setting; influences which direct German development, influences from within and such as come from neighboring countries. Among the makers of the spirit of the century Schnabel puts in the first place Herder, whose books made the Germans conscious of their national genius. Next

stands the new humanism of the leaders, their worship of subjectivism and personality. Then there is the romantic movement. Government is radically changed by the new ideas of men like Stein and Hardenberg. Beside them we have Scharnhorst the military reformer and Humboldt who changes the system of education. Following all this there is the story of Napoleon's overthrow, his retreat from Russia, his defeat in the Wars of Liberation, finally some pages on the Vienna Congress which remakes the map of Germany. In volume II there are three sections which carry the terse headings: order, movement, combat. We have here the fight for the constitutional government which was to give to the people their share in the affairs of the state. Metternich's policy, the Holy Alliance, showed that the German princes had learned no more from the French Revolution than the rest of the European kings. Hence discontent and disaffection everywhere. Thus the order that was, brings the movement that came. Its name is Liberalism. Rotteck's *Staatslexikon* and the writings of Dahlmann blazed the trail. They spread the demand for representative government. England and the United States were pointed out as the models to copy. There follows then the actual fight for constitutional rights. It begins at the universities and spreads rapidly over the German provinces, until in the end it achieves what it set out to accomplish. The author has given this volume the subtitle: "Monarchy and People's Sovereignty." That summarizes the contents perfectly. Volume III deals with German intellectual life and scientific achievements. Schnabel characterizes the nineteenth century as the age of the constitution and the machine! It would seem to him that for a complete account of the period, learning, science and the technical arts can not be left out from the story. He groups the material about four heads; Hegel and his time being the first. There we have all about Hegel's philosophy and its effects upon those that accept it. Next is the section on the social sciences; some 130 pages on famed historians such as Niebuhr, Savigny, Ranke, Möhler and others. There follow the natural sciences with summaries on the work of Liebig, Mayer, Helmholtz, and others. The last chapter takes up the technical arts. It tells about the amazing development of the industries, railroads, machines, navigation. With exemplary thoroughness all the resulting problems are considered. You have the rise of the technical college, the question of tariff protection, emigration, the Malthusian theories. Everything that meant something in the national life is recorded for the student, from beginning to end. In his preface to volume III the author promises a fourth volume in which he will describe the ever-increasing individualism toward the end of the century; how it turns into utter radicalism which is combated only by the religious forces of the nation.

The *Historisches Jahrbuch* says of Schnabel: "Hier ist wieder einer der Geschichte schreiben kann." That is true. The work shows throughout perfect comprehension of all facts and ideas. The author generally succeeds in convincing the reader. The grouping of the material is admirable. The conception is objective. The author looks placidly at a very confused scene without being frightened or in the least ruffled by anything he sees. With the same serene calm he speaks his opinion on what he sees, and he

does so with the sovereign mind of the true historian who knows how to judge men and matters. Some of the portraits he draws are real gems. It must have cost the author considerable study to be able to draw pen pictures like the one taken of Ranke in vol. III. It is typical of Schnabel's method. The ideas which actuated the great master of history are the object of his concern. These he sets down rather than some facts or dates of his career. So it is all through the three volumes; it is the ideas behind the movements, the aims and purposes of the actors rather than their mere deeds that are dealt with in this work. Thus this history becomes a living human record, a veritable moving picture with all the actors reacting on the printed page what they have acted once in the sight of God and men. Schnabel's history is not a series of events but real *Kulturgeschichte* in the best sense of the term. The work is written in fluent and elegant German, the charm of the style adding greatly to the fascination of the contents. (A. M. JEURGENS, S. V. D.)

SHAW, ROBERT (Transl.), *Theory and History of Bibliography.* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1934, pp. xiv, 306, $3.75.) As stated in the Preface, "This book presents a translation of the theoretical-historical portion of George Schneider's *Handbuch der Bibliographie*, third edition, 1926." After an introductory discussion on general matters pertaining to the science of bibliography (pp. 3-59), the author treats at length the threefold procedure to be observed in the preparation of a bibliography; viz., "The Collection of Titles" (pp. 63-100), "The Entering of Titles" (pp. 101-139), and "The Arrangement of Titles" (pp. 140-268). The last part of the volume (pp. 271-293) is an excellent study of "The Development of Bibliography." The volume is replete with many valuable suggestions that will be of eminent service to librarians and that teachers of the scientific method will find most useful for classroom discussion and for practical work. (F. B. S.)

SHUSTER, GEORGE N., *Strong Man Rules, An Interpretation of Germany Today.* (New York, D. Appleton-Century Co., Inc., 1934, pp. vii, 291, $2.00.) The strong man is Hitler. "But," says the author, "Hitler is a windbag and a wire-puller—a politician who knows how to capitalize his own emotions and those of others." Again he says: "So much has been written about this talkative and inchoate little person that one hesitates to add to the supply. Still a few things remain to be said on this as on all subjects; and I am inclined to think them rather essential. Hitler is a politician of whom it might be said that if he had not existed it would have been necessary to invent him." Now the inevitableness of such a man as Hitler leading the great German people is explained in six chapters under the rather whanging titles: "The Return of the Hero"; "Politics in the American Way"; "The New Jerusalem"; "'The dirty Jew'"; "The New Churches"; "Social Order according to the Prophets." There are a seventh chapter and a conclusion, simply headed, respectively, "What I saw in Germany" and "Conclusion." In a "Note on the Evidence," the author gives a select bibliography. But the work is no mere product of the study. The author, who is quite at home in the German language and culture, bases his statements upon many months of first-hand observation. Besides comments on Church matters here and there in the book, students of Church history

will find pertinent matter in the chapter, "The New Churches." (THOMAS J. MCGOURTY.)

STONE, RICHARD GABRIEL, *Hezekiah Niles as an Economist.* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1933, pp. xii, 137.) In this excellent monograph Mr. Stone tells us of the life and economic principles of one of America's early publishers and economists. While not producing any outstanding work in the field of economics Hezekiah Niles for many years published a weekly periodical in Baltimore which was featured by editorials in which the editor commented on the important events of the day. It is largely from this source, *The Weekly Register*, that the author has been able to present the economic views of Mr. Niles. Mr. Niles is described as seldom entering local controversies and almost exclusively devoting himself to national affairs. Intensely patriotic during this formative period of American economic and political policies, Mr. Niles worked industriously to devise methods which would enable his country to secure economic independance. Stimulated by this desire Mr. Niles was a strong advocate of protection as a means of developing home industry. In this connection he was acquainted with many of the leading proponents of tariff legislation. The author describes Mathew Carey as a "friend of many years standing." It is curious to note that during his extended advocacy of protection Niles utterly ignored Friedrich List, the German economist. The author describes this omission probably as intentional and likely the result of some personal disagreement. Peculiarly enough Niles was opposed to the Bank of the United States although he recognized the necessity of sound banking. This attitude is explained by Mr. Stone as fear that the bank would become a monopoly and that it would be used as a political force by the Federalists. Mr. Niles expressed himself freely on other leading questions such as slavery, population, and wages. On the perplexing question of slavery Niles believed in emancipation but opposed any sudden change. Good wages and an increasing population Niles believed indicated a condition of prosperity. The important economic events during the lifetime of Niles (1777-1839) and the editor's position concerning these problems have been adequately treated by the author in such a manner as to make the study not only interesting but highly valuable. (JOHN A. BALL, JR.)

TOYNBEE, ARNOLD J., assisted by V. M. Boulter, *Survey of International Affairs, 1933.* [Royal Institute of International Affairs.] (London, Oxford University Press, 1934, pp. vii, 636, 3 maps.) Toynbee's annual *Survey* has become an almost indispensable reference work on international affairs. Beginning in 1920, the series now comprises fourteen volumes, including a consolidated index for the years 1920-1930. The 1933 volume is arranged in four parts and an appendix. "World Economic Affairs," "Disarmament and Security," "The American Continent" and "The Far East" are the titles of the four major sections. The appendix includes a most valuable chronology of events and a well-prepared index. Worthy of special note by American students is an objective study of the relations between Cuba and the United States, 1898-1934. (JOHN J. MENG.)

WEBSTER, HUTTON, and WESLEY, EDGAR BRUCE, *World Civilization.* (New York, D. C. Heath & Co., 1934, pp. vi, 844, $2.12.) This book has been written to provide students in the secondary schools with a text that can be studied within the limits of a one-year course. The difficulty of writing a text within such limits is too obvious to need remarking. In general the authors have managed excellently. Some criticism, however, may be leveled at certain statements. The fairly complete description of the Neanderthal man (p. 7) would read more plausibly if the word "'possibly" had been inserted. The authors seem to be unusually enthusiastic over Arab civilization and they are especially partial (p. 310) to the glories of Arab architecture. Some will wonder if the explanation of indulgences (p. 408) can not be clarified somewhat. But against these there is the general character of the book which is the product of sound scholarship. (P. J. F.)

WEILER, Dr. PETER, *Die Kirchliche Reform im Erzbistum Koln, 1583-1615.* (Munster i. W., Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1931, pp. vi, 185, 9.40 RM.) The present study is another important contribution to the history of the post-Tridentine reform movement in Germany. It relates how in the Archdiocese of Cologne, where the provisions and enactments of the Council of Trent were comparatively late in finding due entry and support, the work of ecclesiastical reform was not seriously undertaken until 1595. That they were undertaken at all was due in large measure to the influence of Duke Ferdinand of Bavaria who was elected diocesan coadjutor in that year and entrusted with the government of the archdiocese. So great, however, were the obstacles to reform that, as the author of this study points out (p. 151), only after twenty years of untiring efforts the Tridentine reform could be enforced with comparative ease. The study, heavily documented, is based largely on manuscript sources preserved in domestic and foreign archives. (F. B. S.)

WHITAKER, ARTHUR PRESTON, Professor of American History, Cornell University, *The Mississippi Question, 1795-1803.* (New York, D. Appleton-Century Company, 1934, pp. vii, 342, $3.50.) This volume sheds considerable new light on the series of events that form the opening chapter in the history of what in 1800 was regarded as the "new frontier" of the United States. As the subtitle states, it is "A Study in Trade, Politics, and Diplomacy," the chief contributing factors that must be adequately understood before a correct estimate can be made of Jefferson's purchase of Louisiana in 1803. Professor Whitaker, whose splendid volume of *Documents* it was our privilege to review last year in these pages (see the REVIEW, April, 1934, pp. 74-77), manifests in the present study not merely a scholar's thorough grasp of the theme with its manifold complications, but at the same time enriches our historical literature with a narrative that appeals by its clarity of diction and fascinates by its vividness of style. This volume proves, we think, that a work of history, to be attractive and "readable," need not be uncritical and commonplace; that a writer who masters his subject can very well observe all the canons of historical criticism and still produce a work that the layman will read with interest and profit.

In Part One (pp. 3-47), the author portrays the "Two Frontiers" com-

prising the United States settlements in what was then our Southwest and the Spanish holdings in the two Floridas and Louisiana. Part Two (pp. 51-97) depicts "The Aftermath of San Lorenzo," unfolding the conditions, military and commercial, that obtained in the two frontiers after and largely in consequence of the treaty of 1795 between the United States and Spain. In Part Three (pp. 101-186), which is entitled "From Lorenzo to Paris" and forms perhaps the most entertaining portion of the volume, the author relates the events that occurred in Louisiana and in Europe between 1795 and 1802, showing in the latter case what complications developed on the eve of France's purchase of Louisiana from Spain in 1802. Part Four (pp. 189-267) shows how also in this instance "The Flag Follows Trade"—how the trade-minded settlers of the United States in the "new frontier" asserted themselves more and more, this finally resulting in the negotiations whereby France in 1803, in violation of the earlier agreement with Spain, sold Louisiana to the United States, a sale which, to quote the author, "for the United States . . . was only the beginning of our imperial progress to the Pacific Ocean" (p. 266).

In his "Bibliographical Note" the author points out that it did not seem "necessary to list the printed works consulted in the preparation of this study" since these are properly referred to in the "Notes" in the rear of the volume (pp. 271-327), where it will also be seen that "extensive use was made of government archives of Spain . . . France . . . and the United States" (p. 269). This is a departure—and, we think, a happy one—from the general custom of adducing lengthy lists of printed works, many of which (as happens so often) the author of the book scarcely used and perhaps never saw. To quote them fully and intelligibly, as Professor Whitaker does, when occasion offers in the course of the study should be sufficient. The neatly drawn chart forming the frontispiece of the present volume is a great help toward understanding the incidents and problems discussed. Professor Whitaker's *The Mississippi Question* together with Professor Lyon's recent study of *Louisiana in French Diplomacy, 1759-1804*, will have to be consulted as the standard works by teachers and students for many a year to come. (Francis Borgia Steck.)

Williams, W. E., M. A., *The Rise of Gladstone to the Leadership of the Liberal Party, 1859-1868*. (Cambridge, at the University Press; New York, The Macmillan Company, 1934, pp. ix, 189, $2.75.) This book, which won the Prince Consort Prize in 1932, may well be recommended to anyone who is searching for a more detailed explanation of the rise of Gladstone, than is given by the standard biographies. The author makes no effort to present the background which made the developments of the period from 1859 to 1868 possible. It is an excellent example of a historical study, restricted as to time and subject, carefully planned, and well executed. English scholarship appears to excellent advantage in this volume. The Gladstone Papers constitute the major sources; among these are letters from Bright, Cobden, Russell, Clarendon, Forster and other leaders of English life. Not all were in agreement with Gladstone, but all found that it was essential to keep in touch with him in order to keep abreast of English political developments. The conflicts which Gladstone had with Palmerston in the period from 1858

until the latter died in 1865 are analyzed. One of the strongest chapters in the book is entitled "The Reform Bills of 1866 and 1867." The author makes clear the complicated developments leading to those two bills, and the part played by Gladstone on each occasion. Gladstone, forging ahead to the leadership of the Liberal party, never permitted himself nor his party to lose sight of such great issues as economy in government, parliamentary reform, and the settlement of the Irish question. Gladstone knew that although England might be diverted occasionally to other matters, she could never become a great nation so long as any one of the three matters mentioned was demanding settlement. Gladstone was not able to settle them by the year 1868, it is true, nor by the year 1894, for that matter, but he did direct the attention of thoughtful Englishmen to those problems. The long and numerous quotations from the letters of the principals involved make the book very valuable to one who is trying to reconstruct that important decade of nineteenth-century English life. (PAUL KINIERY.)

WILMS, HIERONYMUS, O. P., *Albert the Great, Saint and Doctor of the Church.* (London, Burns and Washbourne, 1933, pp. xxi, 226.) Saint Albert was a many-sided genius and his extraordinary learning, manifested in his published works, earned for him at a very early hour the well-merited title of *Doctor Universalis.* The universality of Albert's genius is well described by Father Wilms in his Albert the Great. The opening chapter gives a brief sketch of the Saint's life and the rest of the book outlines clearly the encyclopedic character of Albert's mind. The Saint is first introduced to us in his relation to Science, then follows his relation to Philosophy and finally his relation to Theology and Exegesis. In this way the reader may form a very accurate picture of the intellectual and spiritual life of the Saint. The work was originally published in German and the present volume in English form is due to the Reverend Adrian English, O. P., and Philip Hereford. The value of the English work is enhanced by the addition of much original matter and by the insertion of a number of rare cuts from the collections of Father Angelus Walz, O. P., and Doctor Herbert Scheeben. (J. S. CONSIDINE, O. P.)

YEO, MARGARET, *Don Juan of Austria.* (New York, Sheed & Ward, Inc., 1934, pp. 340.) It is a difficult task to present within the covers of a small book more of the life of Don Juan of Austria than a mere recital of his exploits and accomplishments; there is no space to tell of the rich and varied religious and political background which gives them meaning and vitality. There exists an abundance of accessible data but the organization of them into a successful popular biography has not yet been achieved. Margaret Yeo has told a lively story of Don Juan's youth, his devotion to his guardians, his meeting with Charles V, and his two romantic episodes, but of his great victories over Moors and Turks, his relations with the prominent persons of his brother's court, and the political factors which made him a figure to be reckoned with in Rome and in the courts of the northern Europe the author gives us only dry bones. In spots, it should be added, the language is too colloquial. (E. W. L.)

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

The Value of the Teaching of Medieval History: a Discussion. W. E. Brown (*History*, March).

The Changing Feudalism of the Middle Ages. F. M. Stenton (*History*, March).

The Chronology of the Reign of Herod the Great. T. Corbishley, S. J. (*Journal of Theological Studies*, January).

Gallicanism *versus* Catholicism. Ruaraidh Erskine of Marr (*Month*, June).

The Office and Honors of an Archimandrite. Cirillo Korolevskij (*Pax*, April).

La tragédie de l'Église évangélique, VII. Pierre Delattre, S. J. (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, May).

The Society of the Atonement: Its Genesis and History (continued). T. J. O'Connell (*Lamp*, May).

The Centenary of Pius X. H. W. Kirwin (*Columbia*, June).

El arte religioso en el siglo XX. A. Garcia de la Fuente (*Religion y Cultura*, May).

Los cinuenta primeros años de dominación española en Mejico (1522-1572). F. B. Steck, O. F. M. (*Religion y Cultura*, May).

I Gesuiti nel Venezuela. N. E. Navarro (*Il Pensiero Missionario*, March).

Abyssinia's Emperor and the Catholic Missions. J. M. Lenhart, O. M. Cap. (*America*, April 27).

EUROPEAN

Jean-Joachim Gausserand, évêque constitutionnel du Tarn (1749-1820). Émile Apollis (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, March).

Recrutement sacerdotal et les Ecoles Secondaires Ecclésiastiques du Diocèse de Versailles pendant la période concordataire (1802-1906). Bernard Perrin (*Revue des Études Historiques*, January-March).

Un grand missionnaire oublié, le P. Pacifique de Provins, Capucin, III. Godefroy de Paris, O. M. Cap. (*Collectanea Franciscana*, April).

En torno a la contienda entre Paulo IV y Felipe II (1556-1557): las treguas y los "accordios." F. Rodriguez Pomar (*Razón y Fe*, May).

Un missionero ilustre: el P. Francisco de Ortega, agostino. Eleuterio Turrado (*Religion y Cultura*, May).

Don José Nicolás de Azara y su intervención en la extinción de la Compañia de Jesus. L. A. Martinez (*Revista Zurita*, July-December, 1934).

Nationalkirche und was die Geschichte dazu sagt. Ernest Böminghaus, S. J. (*Stimmen der Zeit*, April).

Church and State in Germany. Bishop Ludwig Mueller (*Commonweal*, May 24).

The Story of the Dominicans in Germany. T. A. Murphy, O. P. (*Torch*, May).

The Medical School at Padua and the Renaissance of Medicine. Arturo Castiglioni (*Annals of Medical History*, May).

L'istituzione dell' inquisizione monastico-papale a Venezia nel secolo XIII. Ilarino da Milano, O. M. Cap. (*Collectanea Franciscana*, April).

Pedro Crockaert, O. P., Maestro de Francisco de Vitoria. R. G. Villoslada (*Estudios Eclesiasticos*, April).

Le Carcerelle e i primi Cappuccini in Assisi (1535-1935). Francesco da Vicenza, O. M. Cap. (*Collectanea Franciscana*, April).

Origine e principali vicende dell' archidiocesi di Scutari. Antonio Castellucci (*Il Pensiero Missionario*, March).

BRITISH EMPIRE

The Venerable Bede: Ascension Eve, 735-1935. (*London Times Literary Supplement*, May 23).

Hayless Abbey (1245-1539). St. Clair Baddeley (*Pax*, June).

How Sir Ralph d'Osmond Became a Monk: a Study in Eleventh-Century Benedictine History. Columba Stension, O. S. B. (*Pax*, June).

Saint Thomas More (1478-1535). S. P. Delany (*Catholic World*, May).

More and Scholarship. G. A. Fressanges (*Month*, May).

Thomas More. G. K. Chesterton (*America*, May 11).

Humanist und Martyrer: Thomas Morus (1478-1535). Ernst Böminghaus, S. J. (*Stimmen der Zeit*, May).

John Fisher. Hilaire Belloc (*America*, May 11).

John Fisher, Scholar and Saint. William Browne (*Modern Churchman*, May).

Fisher and More: Saints. Francis Talbot, S. J. (*America*, April 6).

John Fisher and Thomas More. (*London Times Literary Supplement*, May 30.)

Los nuevos santos ingleses (continued). C. Bayle (*Razón y Fe*, May).

Legislation of the Medieval English Church, I. C. R. Cheney (*English Historical Review*, April).

Student Numbers at Medieval Oxford. G. G. Coulton (*History*, March).

The Bloody Assizes in Somerset. Ethelbert Horne (*Downside Review*, April).

Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century and To-day. Bp. E. A. Knox (*Churchman*, April).

Some Personal Reminiscences of Cardinal Bourne. Sir James Marchant (*Downside Review*, April).

Catholic Action for Historical Studies. T. Corcoran, S. J. (*Irish Monthly*, May). Work of the Irish MSS. Commisssion.

Dr. Thomas Hussey. Canon Power (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, May).

Anglo-Norman Dublin and Diocese. M. V. Ronan (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, May).

Les Acadiens. Paul Rousseau (*Revue des tudes Historiques*, January-March).

UNITED STATES

The Fiftieth Anniversary Meeting (American Historical Association). H. E. Bourne (*American Historical Review*, April).

The Writing of American History in America from 1884 to 1934. T. C. Smith (*American Historical Review*, April).

The Literature of American History, 1934. H. S. Comager (*Social Studies*, April).

The Lay Apostolate in U. S. A. J. J. Neville Gorrell (*Month*, June).

The "Myth" of the Kensington Stone. H. R. Holand (*New England Quarterly*, March).

Civil Government and Society in New Mexico in the Seventeenth Century. F. V. Scholes (*New Mexico Historical Review*, April).

Religion in the Early Boston Public Schools. J. F. Roche (*Thought*, June).

The Faith in Connecticut. Joseph Gurn (*Columbia*, June).

Father John Nicholas Mertz, Pioneer Priest (1764-1844). J. M. Lenhart, O. M. Cap. (*Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, April, May, June).

The Know-Nothing Party in Pennsylvania. W. F. Hewitt (*Pennsylvania History*, April).

No Popery One Hundred Years Ago. F. J. Zwierlein (*Thought*, June).

The Representative Lutheran Periodical Press and Slavery, 1831-1860. Robert Fortenbaugh (*Lutheran Church Quarterly*, April).

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here does not preclude extended notice in the REVIEW.*)

Attwater, Donald, *The Catholic Church in Modern Wales* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1935, pp. xiii, 235, 8/6).

Brown, Sydney MacGillvary, *Medieval Europe* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., revised edition, 1935, pp. xiii, 635, $3.25).

Berdyaev, Nicholas, *The Bourgeois Mind* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1935, pp. 130, $1.25).

Carminati, Don Cesar, *Barthelemie Capitanio* (Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1934, pp. 167).

d'Eschevannes, Dr. Carlos, *Le Merveilleux Corps Humain* (Paris: P. Téqui, 1934, pp. 221, 20 fr.).

Faulkner, Harold Underwood, *American Economic History* (New York: Harper & Brothers, third edition, 1935, pp. xvi, 816, $3.50).

Gerster, A. Zeil, *P. Thomas Villanova, Ius Religiosorum in compendium redactum pro invenibus religiosis* (Turin: Casa Editrice Marietti, 1935, pp. 324).

Goodenough, Erwin R., *By Light, Light the Mystic Gospel of Hellenistit Judaism* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale Univ. Press, 1935, pp. 436, $5.00).

Gough, John Francis, *The Private Letters of Baron de Viomenil on Polish Affairs, with a Letter on the Siege of Yorktown* (Jersey City: Collins Doan Co., 1935, pp. xv, 275).

Haiman, Miecislaus, *The Fall of Poland in Contemporary American Opinion* (Chicago: Polish R. C. Union of America, 1935, pp. xv, 271).

Hartley, Olga, *Women and the Catholic Church: Yesterday and Today* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1935, pp. vii, 262, 5/).

Herder & Co., *Der Grose Herder Nachschlagewerk für Wissen und Leben*, Zehnter Band, Reue *bis* Sipo (Herder, 1935, pp. 1727, $9.50).

Institut Français de Washington, *Voyage dans l'Interieur des Etats-Unis et au Canada* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1935, pp. xx, 35, $2.75).

Jackson, J. Hampden, *A Modern History of Europe: 1069-1918* (New York: Harper, 1935, pp. 1236, $3.00).

Jacks, L. V., *Mother Marianne of Molokai* (New York: Macmillan, 1935, pp. vi, 203, $2.00).

Jarrett, Bede, O. P., *The Emperor Charles IV* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1935, pp. xxi, 247, $3.00).

Leonard, Rev. Joseph, C. M., *Thoughts from St. Vincent de Paul, selected and arranged for each day of the Year* (London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1935, pp. 134, 2/6).

Lloyd, A. H., *Christ's College in the University of Cambridge* (New York: Macmillan, 1934, pp. xcii, 477, $7.50).

Lloyd, A. H., *De qui se passe en Allemagne* (Paris: Maison de la Bonne Presse, 1935, pp. 235).

Moore, Dom Thomas Verner, M. D., Ph. D., *Principles of Ethics—Virtue versus Vice* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1935, pp. x, 381, $3.00).

O'Connell, Rev. Sir John R., *Lyra Martyrum: The Poetry of the Martyrs: 1503-1681* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 1934, pp. 122, 6/-).

O'Rourke, William T., *Library Handbook for Catholic Students* (Milwaukee: Bruce Pub. Company, 1935, pp. xvi, 184, $2.25).

Patterson, Frances Taylor, *White Wampum, the Story of Kateri Tekakwitha* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1935, pp. 304, $2.00).

Raemers-Poulet, *Church History*, Vol. II (St. Louis: Herder, 1935, pp. xxi, 735, $5.00).

Rappoport, Dr. Angelo S., *Mediaeval Legends of Christ* (New York: Scribner's, 1935, pp. 312, $3.00).

Ring, Sister M. Ignatius, S. N. D., *Villeneuve-Bargemong: Precursor of Modern Social Catholicism: 1784-1850* (Milwaukee: Bruce Pub. Co., 1935, pp. xxxiii, 265, $3.50).

Roz, Firmin, *L'Histoire du Canada: 1534-1934* (Paris: Hartmann, 1934, pp. xxi, 331, 25 fr.).

Singleton, Evelyn E., *Workmen's Compensation in Maryland* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1935, pp. 130).

Stephenson, Carl, *Mediaeval History of Europe from the Fourth to the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Harper, 1935, pp. xviii, 797, $3.50).

Undset, Sigrid, *Saga of Saints* (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1934, pp. xii, 321, $2.50).

Walsh, William, *Isabella the Crusader* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1935, pp. 308, $2.50).

Wilson, H. W. Pub. Co. Edited, *International Bibliography of Historical Sciences* (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., Fifth Year, 1934, cxii, 513).

CONTRIBUTORS OF ARTICLES AND MISCELLANY

DR. ERNEST STEIN, Visiting Professor of Byzantine History in the Catholic University of America, is one of the foremost Byzantine scholars. He received his doctorate at the University of Vienna in 1914, and was later appointed extraordinary professor at the University of Berlin. He came to Washington in the autumn of 1934.

MATTHEW PAGE ANDREWS, A. M., Litt. D., is a graduate of Washington and Lee University. After some years spent in teaching in private schools of Virginia and Maryland, Dr. Andrews became literary advisor for the Yale University Press and had an important share in the publication of the *Chronicles of America*. He is the author of many historical works, among which are the following: *A History of the United States*, 1913; *A Brief History of the United States*, 1916; *A Heritage of Freedom*, 1918; *American History and Government*, 1921; *The Book of the American's Creed*, 1921; *The Biggest Book in the World*, 1925; *History of Maryland, Province and State*, 1929; and the *Founding of Maryland*, 1933.

REV. FRANCIS A. MULLIN, Ph. D., has been professor of history at Columbia College, Dubuque, Iowa. He completed his work for the doctorate in medieval history at the Catholic University of America in 1930, his dissertation being *A History of the Work of the Cistercians in Yorkshire: 1131-1300*. At present he is engaged in additional research work at the University of Michigan.

REV. JOHN LAUX, the author of several successful textbooks on American history, is a priest of the Diocese of Covington, Ky.